

Winter 2011

A Study of Two Generations of Culturally Diverse Community College Students Views on Leader Attributes in Self and Others

Paula Jeanine Hodkowski
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Community College Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hodkowski, Paula J.. "A Study of Two Generations of Culturally Diverse Community College Students Views on Leader Attributes in Self and Others" (2011). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, Educational Foundations & Leadership, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/1kbt-a713
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/efl_etds/125

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Foundations & Leadership at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Educational Foundations & Leadership Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

**A STUDY OF TWO GENERATIONS OF CULTURALLY DIVERSE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS VIEWS ON LEADER ATTRIBUTES IN
SELF AND OTHERS**

by

Paula Jeanine Hodkowski
B.S.N May 1978, Loyola University of Chicago
M.S.N January 1988, Lewis University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
December 2011

Approved by:

Dana D. Burnett (Chair)

Jennifer K. Green (Member)

Mitchell R. Williams (Member)

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF TWO GENERATIONS OF CULTURALLY DIVERSE COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS VIEWS ON LEADER ATTRIBUTES IN SELF AND OTHERS

Paula Jeanine Hodkowski
Old Dominion University, 2011
Director: Dr. Dana Burnett

One community college mission is preparing students for the expectations and opportunities of the workplace including roles as collaborators and leaders. Increasingly, representatives from “cultures” of generation, gender, and diverse ethnicities are gaining an education in community colleges. Research supports that cultural aspects and views of others impact an individual’s leader identity.

The purpose of this quantitative, non-experimental study was to determine if participants representing millennial and generation X self-report leader behaviors of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act”; and rate leader traits in others responding to “fits my image of a leader;” And to determine if their responses differ significantly by generation, gender, ethnicity.

The study population was students enrolled in a public, suburban, Midwestern United States community college which serves 26 culturally diverse communities. The sample consisted of 376 participants enrolled in randomly selected courses. Descriptive statistics and a between groups factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) are reported. The research data indicates there were no statistically significant cultural differences in the reports of respondents rating leader attributes in self and leader traits in others. This data serves in recognizing commonalities and differences within culturally diverse groups; and opening dialogue for leader development in a community college.

This thesis is dedicated to “my guys” for being there in every way possible. I looked forward to, and I am so very grateful for, what you each contributed along my journey in completing the coursework, homework, internships, summer camps, candidacy exam, and especially this heartfelt work.

Michael, the “Hod”, my best friend since we were the “younger” generation;
Matthew, my special and favorite man of generation X; and my wonderful and favorite
millennial buddy, Ryne,

Thank you for believing in me and helping me to believe in myself.

LYTM

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to these special people for the guidance and expertise in assisting me with this work about the next generations, to whom we ready to accept the passed torch:

Dr. Dana Burnett, your scholarly approach helped me to complete research and create a document of which I am very proud.

Dr. Jennifer Green, with whom I first spoke on my birthday, and has since been a wonderful present and presence in my life.

Dr. Mitch Williams, a complete and kind educator, who exemplifies the term “leader”.

Andy, the best V.P., who without hesitation, welcomed me for the internship experiences of a lifetime. Beth, affording me answers and access for my research at the college, you worked beyond your job description. All my CCL cohort “people” who somehow knew the best words to say or not say; and did the right things at the time they were needed along our journey.

All the teachers and students, who welcomed me into your classes and chose to share your views, I am indebted to you all. Your excitement while participating was so deeply felt and I am encouraged about your contributions to our world...

My wonderful friends and family, for the positive energy and best thoughts, that many a day, carried me.

Dad and ma, Even when there was little money, there was no question that education was a value and valued. Thinking that way, how could one not use the resources, abilities, and passions to educate one self and strive to best help others, in a life well spent?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND: CURRENT REALITIES	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	7
DEFINITION OF TERMS	8
PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY	10
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	11
SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY	11
RELATIONSHIP TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEADERSHIP	13
OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	13
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	13
RESEARCH INSTRUMENTATION	14
POPULATION AND SAMPLE	16
SUMMARY	19
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	20
COMMUNITY COLLEGE MISSION	22
A CHANGING NATURE OF LEADERSHIP	34
EXEMPLARY LEADERSHIP PRACTICES	37
THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY	41
INFLUENCES IN LEADERSHIP IDENTITY	43
TRAIT THEORY	56
RESEARCH OF LORD AND COLLEAGUES	60
RATINGS OF LEADERSHIP TRAITS	64
LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTES	66
SUMMARY	67
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	69
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	70
STUDY VARIABLES	71
POPULATION AND PARTICIPANT SAMPLE	73
PARTICIPATING COMMUNITY COLLEGE DATA	73
PARTICIPANT SELECTION PROCEDURE	77
RESEARCH DESIGN	78
INSTRUMENTATION	80
PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS	85
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE	86
DATA ANALYSIS	87
LIMITATIONS	88

	Page
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS	89
PROFILE OF STUDENT PARTICIPANTS.....	89
ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH QUESTION ONE.....	96
ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH QUESTION TWO.....	103
SUMMARY	111
CHAPTER V DISCUSSION	113
PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY.....	117
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	118
REVIEW OF THE METHODOLOGY	119
SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS	123
RELATIONSHIP OF CURRENT STUDY TO PREVIOUS RESEARCH	135
IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRACTITIONERS	135
STUDY LIMITATIONS	140
DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	142
CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	143
REFERENCES	146
APPENDICES	162
A. RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	162
B. PERMISSION LETTER TO FACULTY MEMBERS.....	167
C. TEXT FOR INSTRUCTIONS TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS	168
D. PERMISSION LETTERS FOR USE OF COPYRIGHT MATERIALS: LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY AND RATINGS OF LEADERSHIP TRAITS SURVEY	169
VITA.....	173

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Ages of Enrolled Students for 2011 Spring Semester	74
2. Gender of 18,628 Students Enrolled for 2011 Spring Semester	75
3. Reported Ethnicity of 18,628 Students Enrolled for 2011 Spring Semester	76
4. The Questions Representing the Exemplary Leader Behaviors	83
5. Generational Representation of Study Participants	92
6. Gender Percentages of Student Participants	92
7. Representation by Generation and Gender	93
8. Racial and Ethnic Identity	94
9. Participant Representation by Ethnicity, Generation, Gender	95
10. Descending Order of Self-Rated “Modeling the Way” (MO) and “Enabling Others to Act”(E) Leader Behaviors Practiced by 376 Community College Participants	98
11. Estimated Marginal Means by Generation, Gender, Ethnicity for the Dependent Variable Scales for “Modeling the Way” and “Enabling Others to Act”	101
12. Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Generation, Gender, Ethnicity	102
13. Estimated Marginal Means on Leader Traits in Others Rating “Fits My Image of a Leader”	105
14. Multivariate Analysis of Variance Reports for Rating Leader Traits in Others	110
15. The 35 Leader Traits as Identified by Community College Students (2011) and Respondents in the Research by Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984)	131

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Community colleges are in a position to meet both challenges and opportunities for preparing the leaders of tomorrow. These uniquely American institutions have become increasingly instrumental in preparing the country's workforce and, are positioned to continue this mission (Martinez, 2004; McClenney, 2004). The majority of jobs that will be created by 2014 will require some postsecondary education (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009b). This creates an imperative for community college leaders to review the workforce needs, examine current realities, and collaborate with partners to enhance educational opportunity as well as consider leader development for students preparing for their careers (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Williams, 2001). Additionally, community colleges need to be accountable as they prepare a global citizenry with a sense of ethical, social, civic, and personal responsibility (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges in California, 2001; Brint & Karabel, 1989).

Background: Current Realities

Therefore, the current and projected workforce trends and demographics must be examined to identify if community college mission and institutional strategic priorities are aligned to serve the needs and meet the goals of stakeholders. While there are many trends in the workforce, those relevant to this study include: (a) a decrease in the number of generation X workers; (b) a shift in the worker population over 50 and under 30 years of age; (c) a new demographic mix; and (d) increasing diversity (Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998; Humphreys, 2000). These trends are forcing organizations to recruit and retain a

respectful multigenerational work force, with a cohesive leadership team that values the contribution of each individual (Critchley, 2004).

As preparation for serving within this leadership paradigm, individuals are required to recognize and develop leader “attributes” to have an advantage to fulfill leader opportunities in varied workforce and community settings. These attributes are defined in this study as qualities for traits, dispositions, and skills in practice and character while serving in, or viewing, the role of leader. Workplace environments are reporting the use of culturally diverse teams (Combs, 2002; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998) and identify value for individuals to “transcend the limits of their own perspectives” (Kezar, 2000, p. 11). This transcendence can be facilitated by identifying what is valued, reflecting and developing self-awareness, and displaying empathy and openness to others. Currently, there is little written on reflective and leader development practices pertinent to the increasingly diverse community college population: the subject that will be addressed in this study.

There is evidence, as detailed in chapter 2, which indicates “culture” impacts an individual’s actions, communication, beliefs, and values that are reflected in choices and patterns for behavior (Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & deLeon Siantz, 2008). For this study, “culture” includes generation, gender, and ethnicity, as “... institutions of racial, ethnic, religious, or social nature” (Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & deLeon Siantz, 2008, p. 144). Ethnicity refers to a social construct in which group members self-identify and share commonality with others (Cohen, 1978) through a heritage, language, ancestry, or traditions. In light of the fact increasingly diverse constituencies are represented in many previously homogenous organizations and institutions, a need is created to actively

engage students in developing self-awareness and acquiring an understanding of others as steps to effective collaborating or leading (Garza, 2000).

Cultural Diversity

Demographic Mix

The community college offers opportunity to current diverse student populations for accessing, returning, continuing an education, and meeting varied personal goals (McClenney, 2004). Community college enrollments in 1177 institutions account for over 44% of U. S. higher education students with 40% enrolled as full-time students. National demographics identify that community college enrollees consisting of first time freshmen represent 40% of all enrolled U.S. community college students of whom 39% are first generation college attendees; and 36% minorities (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009a). Projections indicate that by 2015 one to two million additional young adults will seek access to college, many from low income and minority families (Greater Expectations, 2000).

Generational Diversity

Generation X students, defined as individuals who are ages 29-49, born in 1961-1981; and millennial students, defined as individuals who are age 28 or younger, born in or after 1982, comprise two distinct generations of community college enrollees. Research on leader practice and preferences, attitudes and values, relationships and communication, identify distinct differences within these two generations (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Critchley, 2004; Gibson, 2007; Martin & Tulgan, 2006; Rodriguez, Green, & Ree, 2003; Tulgan, 2004). The organizations receiving members of generation X and the millennial generation into the workplace are reporting noticeable differences

between the two groups (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Chan, 2005; Gerkovich, 2001; Rodriquez, Green, & Ree, 2003).

These reported differences impose a need for individuals to begin to understand self and develop a connectedness with others (Arsenault, 2004; Evers, Rush, & Berdrow, 1998; Washbush, 1998). Recognizing differences and capitalizing on the strengths and attitudes of diverse groups is: (a) advantageous to organizational movement and outcomes (Arsenault, 2004; Martin & Tulgan, 2006); (b) essential performance antecedents for training, working, and leading; and (c) advantageous to meeting positive outcomes for individuals and organizations (Combs, 2002; Critchley, 2004).

It has been well documented, as discussed in chapter 2, that researchers have identified a collective identity for group members of each generation within social and institutional arenas. This perceived membership carries an expectation for viewing self as an individual agent for change as well as owning a collective persona for the direction for change regarding roles and behaviors within organizations and society (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Pilcher, 1994). Little research has been completed on generational views of students within college settings.

Impact of Gender

The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that by 2016, women will account for 49% or greater of workforce participants, with a large percentage of women (39%), reported working in management, professional, and related occupations (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). Gender studies completed in organizations and four year institutions report gender perceptions as an important aspect of culture that is relevant to leadership (Astin & Leland, 1991). Researchers believe there are benefits in obtaining data to

identify if gender differences play a role in how one views leadership in self and others (Endress, 2000). This data can serve in overcoming misperceptions (Arsenault, 2004) of stereotypes and gender bias (Cundiff, 2006; Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Karau, 2002) as well as promoting opportunity for recognizing similarities and differences (Kezar, 2000) of gender groups.

Ethnicity as a Cultural Diversity

The literature supports that cultural differences impact the perception and preferences for leader attributes in self and others (DenHartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999; Ensari & Murphy, 2003; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Additionally, the literature states that there are positive implications for self-assessment by students toward: (a) developing self-efficacy prior to and while participating in the workplace (Bandura, 1994), (b) acquiring understanding of self and diverse others, (c) becoming empowered to view self as agents of change (Astin, 1997), and (d) beginning qualities important for contributing to organizations and the community in which they exist (Bandura, 1986; Combs, 2002). A leader identity requires developing a self-efficacy for the leadership process, creating a self-identity as a person of influence for change and common purpose (Astin, 1997; Hiller, 2005), and identifying prototypical leader attributes and role model behaviors.

Research has shown that two initial steps in clarifying and acting on one's own potential for becoming a leader and a responsible citizen (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2007) and, in acknowledging differences (Arsenault, 2004; Paine, 2006) is influenced by two foundational processes of: (1) an early identification of leader attributes in self and others (Hall & Lord, 1995; Lord & Maher,

1991; Welch, 2000), and (2) recognition of modeling behaviors (Buford, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1987). Therefore, the second framework examined in this study is the reporting of the recognized leader traits in others. This is relevant to the community college setting because researchers have identified that cultural views may exert an emotional focus for self, relationships with others, in motivation toward work, preference for leaders, and value for a strong sense of obligation toward a leader (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Changing Nature of Leadership

Also impacting organizations are needs toward leader preparation for a changing nature of less traditional (Martin, 2005; Raelin, 2005) and best practice (Kouzes and Posner, 1987; 2002) leadership. This new leadership paradigm champions collaborative, flexible, and interdependent leader behaviors as central to meeting the necessary commitment and direction needed within changing organizational cultures (Martin, 2005; Raelin, 2005). These processes are relational and practiced by value clarification, finding a voice, advocating, setting an example that is aligned with values and beliefs, and choosing involvement (Kouzes & Posner, 2008) which empowers individuals to consider self as a leader, a person of influence (Outcalt, Faris, McMahon, Tahtakran, & Noll, 2001); and a change agent (Astin, 1997).

In developing a leader identity, the research shows that an individual is influenced by identifying role models and attributes of others to clarify and act on one's own potential for becoming a leader and responsible citizen (CAS, 2003). As a community based institution, community colleges and stakeholder partners are at an advantage to develop leaders with a sense of civic responsibility to lead (Astin & Sax, 1998; DeZure, 2008) and who represent and are responsive to, the values and realities of the community

(Bonsall, Harris, & Marczak, 2002; Williams, 2001). Within a nurturing environment, there is a facilitated capacity for individuals to see and learn from leaders from multiple perspectives (Amey, 2005).

The Greater Expectations panel addressed the educational preparation needed for student success and social responsibility stating that students become intentional learners who are responsible and develop self-awareness...and adapt skills... and act in responsible ways in the classroom, workplace, and their communities. Students need to be intentional in developing within diverse teams, accepting accountability for a self-identity based on value while respecting “complex identities of others, their histories, and their cultures” (Greater Expectations, 2000, ¶9). Based on an opportunity, as was afforded in this study, documented data rather than misperceptions could serve as a first step in recognizing and addressing significant issues of diversity (Arsenault, 2004), and acknowledging commonalities, in the community college populations.

Statement of the Problem

In light of the fact there is an increasing role of the community college as a higher education institution positioned to prepare students as citizen-leaders and persons of influence (Astin & Astin, 1995; Mable, 2007; Rost & Barker, 2000); and, the literature identifies the impact of multi-generational and increased diversity within community colleges reflective of the population and workplace (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Combs, 2002; Critchley, 2004; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998; Martin & Tulgan, 2006) an examination of these diverse constituencies is considered timely. The literature supports that a foundation for becoming a leader and responsible citizen (CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, 2003) is grounded in an individual

engaging in assessment and early identification of leader attributes in self (Hall & Lord, 1995; Lord & Maher, 1991; Welch, 2000) and others (Buford, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1987), making it vital that community colleges contribute to this student development process. With little written on views, reflective and leader development practices pertinent to the community college population, this problem statement addresses a gap in research findings and was the focus of this study:

Are community colleges assessing reports of views of culturally diverse populations in order to facilitate a necessary and realistic preparation for students to fulfill roles as collaborators and leaders within workforce and community settings?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the operational definitions are as follows:

Attribute is a characteristic; property; quality; the real nature of what is ascribed (Funk & Wagnalls, 1995). Attributes includes leadership traits, dispositions, influences, skills, and capacity in practice and character (Northouse, 2004; Stanford-Blair & Dickmann, 2005).

Culture which includes generation, gender, and ethnicity is “an integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thoughts, communications, actions, customs, beliefs, values, and institutions of racial, ethnic, religious, or social nature” (Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & deLeon Siantz, 2008, p. 144). Ethnicity refers to a social construct in which group members self-identify and share commonality with others (Cohen, 1978) through a heritage, language, ancestry, or traditions.

Generation is the aggregate of all people born in the span of a phase of life, generally 20 years, who share a common location in history, and a collective persona (Strauss and Howe, 1997). Generations are historically determined and forged by common events with members who share what Mannheim (1927) states “a common location in the social and historical process” predisposing them to certain modes of thought and action (Vaidhyanathan, 2008).

Leadership, in a new context, is practiced when the leader engages in five behaviors: (1) “modeling the way” by following one’s own values, finding a voice to defend beliefs, and setting an example, (2) “inspiring a shared vision” by inspiring others for change or new ideas, as well as committing to vision and beliefs of others, (3) “challenging the process” by seeking opportunities to learn, grow, innovate and improve, (4) “enabling others to act” by fostering collaboration and trust, thereby empowering others, and (5) “encouraging the heart” by appreciation for each member while creating a culture of collective identity, authenticity, and celebration (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Self-efficacy is self-influenced and self-judged cognitive and affective beliefs about capabilities. Self-efficacy contributes to an individual’s motivated investment in actions and perseverance to produce an effect and meet outcome expectations and accomplishments for performance (Bandura, 1997; Locke, 2000).

The “*generation X*” students are ages 29-49, born in 1961-1981. Minor variations in these birth years for this generation have been noted in the literature. This 20-year span is designated by Howe & Strauss (2000). These students are commonly referred to in the literature as non-traditional age college students because of their chronological age and

delay in entering college (Critchley, 2004). In 2007 there were 46 million members of generation X (Gibson, 2007).

The *millennial* students are age 28 or younger, born in or after 1982-2002. Minor variations in these birth years for this generation have been noted in the literature (Arsenault, 2004; Dulin, 2008; Tulgan, 2004; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). This 20-year span is designated by Howe & Strauss (2000). In 2007 there were 76 million members of the millennial generation (Gibson, 2007). Noting these children were born as products of a birth rate increase coinciding with a record immigration surge will cause the millennial cohort to be comprised of as many as 100 million members (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p. 15). These students are commonly referred to in the literature as traditional age college students because of their chronological age and entry into college immediately following secondary education (Critchley, 2004).

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this non-experimental study was to determine if two generations of community college student participants enrolled at a Midwest, public community college differed significantly in their self-report of engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” as identified by Kouzes and Posner (2002) based on their generation, gender, ethnicity. Additionally, the research examined a student’s views of other leaders’ traits, as identified by Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984), responding to “fits my image of a leader” and to determine if their responses differed significantly by generation, gender, ethnicity.

Based on the operational definition of culture, the three independent variables were: (1) generation, (2) gender, and (3) ethnicity. The generations are defined as generation X members with birth years 1961-1981 who are currently ages 29-49; and millennial generation members with birth years 1982-1992 who are currently ages 18-28. The three dependent variables are: (1) leader behaviors for “modeling the way”, (2) leader behaviors for “enabling others to act”, and (3) ratings of 35 leadership traits viewed in others responding to “fits my image of a leader”.

Based on the literature review, two research questions were posed for this study:

Research Questions

Question 1: Is there a statistically significant difference in the two generations of community college student participants’ self-reports of engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors for “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act”, based on generation, gender, ethnicity?

Question 2: Is there a statistically significant difference in the two generations of community college student participants’ reports on their “rating of leader traits” identified in others, responding to “fits my image of a leader”, based on generation, gender, ethnicity?

Significance of This Study

The literature identifies the impact of multi-generational and increased diversity within the population and workplace (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Combs, 2002; Critchley, 2004; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998; Martin & Tuglan, 2006); and reports new conceptual and practice models redefining leadership and a need for leader development (Martin, 2005; Raelin, 2005; Washbush, 1998). These factors impose an increasing role for the

community college in preparing students as citizen-leaders and persons of influence (Astin & Astin, 1995; Mable, 2007; Rost & Barker, 2000). Therefore, the following were considered as significant benefits of this community college study:

An opportunity for community college administrators and educators to access data aimed at identifying and promoting understanding if diverse beliefs are held by community college students who represent stakeholders within the community and workforce

An opportunity to identify a level of perceived self-efficacy from the community college student participants' in reporting their practice of exemplary leader behaviors; and offering reports of leader traits viewed in others from their cultural perspectives of generation, gender, ethnicity

An opportunity to acquire data as a step toward addressing the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2007) initiatives for creating avenues for holistic student development

An opportunity to meet recommendations for sub-baccalaureate education that is research based (Goldrick-Rab, Harris, Mazzeo & Kienzl, 2009) and reflects accountability in higher education for promoting student success (Mable, 2007; Schneider, 2005; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999, 2000)

Relationship to Community College Leadership

Community college stakeholders, including executive leadership members, educators, students, as well as members of businesses and the communities would be served by an opportunity to gather data. This data may contribute to leader development initiatives which capitalize on reported strengths of constituents, promote students toward gaining an understanding of self and others, and consider the performance antecedents important to training, working, and leading within increasingly diverse settings. Projected enrollments in community colleges in 2015 could rise to 46.4% above the level of the 2000 millennial year, with over 10 million traditional age college students (Martinez, 2004) taking advantage of innovative measures taken today on their behalf. What makes this study unique is it was completed in a community college setting with participants representing the changing demographic and diverse cultures.

Overview of Research Methodology

A quantitative and non-experimental research design was chosen for this research study. Approval was given from the Institutional Research and Planning Committee Human Subjects Review Board of the participating Community College and the Old Dominion University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects. All guidelines for minimal risk, appropriate interaction, legal age, private information, and intervention free research were followed.

Theoretical Framework

A practice model for five exemplary leader practices by Kouzes and Posner (1987, 2002), served as one framework in this study, where participants reported views for self on two of the exemplary leader behaviors. The first research instrument was a

modified survey based on the Third Edition of The Leadership Practices Inventory derived from the research of Kouzes and Posner (2003). The Leadership Practices Inventory was selected for this study as it has been deemed an effective measure in the assessment and development of an individual as an exemplary leader (Kouzes & Posner, 1990, 2002, 2003, 2008; Posner, 2009).

The second theoretical framework guiding this study was based on the social-cognitive process of viewing others as leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991). It was chosen to recognize the perception of leader traits, which empirical research identifies is crucial to personal and organizational behavior (Lord & Maher, 1991). Research has shown that the identification of leader traits in role models from diverse cultural backgrounds may promote an individual in making meaning for self (Hall & Lord, 1995; Kezar, 2000; Lord & Emrich, 2001; Welch, 2000) and in establishing inter-dependent relationships (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The second instrument chosen was the Ratings of Leadership Traits due mainly to research which has demonstrated it as an effective measure to identify perceptions of leader traits in others, contributing to perception of self as a leader, self-regulation, and self-efficacy, as well as script development for appropriate motivators and behaviors (Lord, Foti, and DeVader, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1991; Lord & Emrich, 2001).

Research Instrumentation

The research instrument was comprised of three sections aimed to answer the research questions (see Appendix A). A demographic section assigned proper placement to the generation X and millennial cohorts, as well as identified gender and ethnicity of the participants. This report elicits responses: (a) distinguishing age and birth year and

recognizing those respondents not eligible by age and birth year, (b) identifying gender, and (c) distinguishing participants' ethnic background.

The Leadership Practices Inventory. The second section of the research survey was a modified version of the Third Edition of the Leadership Practice Inventory (2003) developed by Kouzes and Posner. It was modified with respondents self-reporting on two of the five exemplary leader behaviors. The modification resulted in the selection of 12 questions for participants' responses comprised of six questions for leader practice behaviors related to "modeling the way", and six questions for leader practice behaviors related to "enabling others to act".

The two leader practices were chosen for this study because they represent the attributes for developing a sense of self as well as the fostering of the development of others, serving as personal and interpersonal behaviors. The practice of "modeling the way" is represented by value clarification; finding a voice; advocating; setting an example that is aligned with values and beliefs; and choosing involvement (Kouzes & Posner, 2008). The practice of "enabling others to act" involves fostering collaboration and co-operation; building trust; strengthening others; and developing confidence and competence (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Participants were instructed to answer the questions relating to any leadership role they have been in or are serving in currently; and to consider each statement in the context of a student, work, or personal organization with which they have been involved as a formal or informal leader. Examples would include, but would not be limited to a club, team, chapter, group, unit, project, program, or service context. The questions and instructions are detailed in chapter 3.

The Ratings of Leadership Traits. The third section of the research survey used in this study was the ratings of leadership traits list, derived from the research of Lord, Foti, and DeVader, which identified the perception of leadership traits reported as “fitting my image of a leader” (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984) completed within a four-year institution. Lord, et al., (1984) proposed that leaders are distinguished from non-leaders based on an abstract prototype and used 11 different contexts of military, educational, business, religious, sports, world political, national political, financial, minority, media, and labor for specific types of leaders.

For the purpose of this study, participants were given consistent verbal and written instructions prior to rating the 35 prototypical leader traits of others, responding to “fits my image of a leader” from 1 (not at all well) to 5 (extremely well) from the list, created in hierarchal order based on the original research. For this community college research study, the numerical ratings of the 35 items were analyzed for significant differences between and within the generational, gender, and ethnic groups in the process of viewing leaders, as described in detail in chapter 4 and in the discussion of the findings for research question two.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was United States community college students. The sample was comprised of participants who were enrolled in a Midwestern suburban community college, from one of the randomly selected class sections and are representatives of generation X and the millennial generations. The main campus of the community college has credit, certificate, and program course offerings for students

representing 26 communities with a total population of nearly 400,000 persons of varied socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, and generational backgrounds.

According to the institutional data available for the full academic year 2009-2010 there was an annual enrollment of over 42,000 students and a Spring 2011 census reporting 18,628 credit seeking students. For a population of 18,000, Orcher (2005) recommends a sample size of 376 participants. The Spring 2011 enrollment indicated a 65.1% millennial to 18.04% generation X population; and, a 4% higher female than male student enrollment. Allowing for these population characteristics, an appropriately diverse sample size was sought to allow generation and gender representation of participants.

The research director at the institution completed a random selection of the course sections for the sample using a computerized database. The participating community college offers approximately 2,800-3,000 course sections each semester, of which approximately 2,500 course sections were available and included for a random selection of classes offered on days, evenings, and weekends. The community college was completing the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), during the spring 2011 semester, and the computer selection had been completed. The classes to be excluded from the random selection for this study were courses that were already selected for completion of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The faculty members teaching the random class sections were assured they would not be completing two research surveys during class time within the same semester.

In order for 376 students to participate, 30 class sections with an expected average class census of 23 and a maximum class size of 32 were randomly selected from the

available class sections. Ideally, this sampling would yield opportunity for access: (1) to a representative diversity of students who attend day, evening, weekend, returning adult, and honors classes, and (2) to students after withdrawal deadlines and a non-scheduled midterm or final exam week. The initial sampling did not result in the desired target number of participants. A second random selection was completed. The study was completed with 26 class sections and data were analyzed from 376 usable surveys. The methodology, sampling, and results are described in detail in chapter 4.

Responses to the two research questions were analyzed by performing a between-groups factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to identify statistically significant differences between the three independent variables, generation, gender, and ethnicity. The MANOVA was chosen because it “emphasizes the mean differences and statistical significance of differences among groups” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 243). MANOVA was also chosen to determine if there is a main and interaction effect between the independent variables and if that interaction is significant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 247). After the data screening process as described in chapter 3, descriptive statistics were completed for each of the independent and dependent variables.

Delimitations

A limitation was present in the inability for the researcher to recognize the generational, gender, and ethnic composition of the attendees in each course section throughout the process of randomly selected computer generated class offerings. Therefore, measures were taken to include many varied class offerings of time, place, and availability in the random course selections. In an effort to secure faculty members support and availability, a dissemination of information on the community college

campus was provided one to four weeks in advance, to increase awareness and allow for plans to participate in the research.

The nature of the participants' views for attributes in self and others may supply data not generalizable to other community colleges and populations. However, the process was completed in a way that may serve community college leaders for further research on their campuses.

Summary

This study provided an opportunity for one community college to gain data reflecting how generational cohort membership, gender, ethnicity, may affect leader perception of self and others. This study supported a first in valuable steps, noted in the literature as developing self-awareness, finding a voice, seeking role models, initiating cultural competence, and capitalizing on opportunities for practice: as contributors to the new skill set required for personal and organizational effectiveness (Arsenault, 2004; Judy & D' Amico, 1997; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Standford-Blair & Dickmann, 2005).

Benefits to the community college include gathering data for assessing and programming to promote the capacities as influential leaders (Mable, 2007; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999; 2000) for the next generation. Community college leaders need data in: (a) planning community college initiatives, (b) recognizing and modeling leader behaviors, (c) creating benchmarks for student leader development, (d) acknowledging influences of cultural diversity, and (e) promoting the strength of commonalities. The literature supporting this study's research questions is detailed in chapter 2.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

There are three main bodies of literature that are relevant to this study. The first pertains to the mission of the community college in preparing the workforce with responsible citizens and future leaders. These leaders will need to maintain personal integrity, while developing an adaptive capacity to bring about positive change and accomplish goals. The current culturally diverse student population has broad-based personal, social, and economic goals and these student goals prompt community college leaders to identify mission and align institutional strategic priorities. These institutional priorities, then, must address the student's diverse needs and facilitate progress toward goal achievement while preparing students for roles within the workforce.

The second body of studies relates to the literature identifying the changing nature of leadership from a traditional, hierarchical, and "position only" approach to an emerging relational, collaborative process (Raelin, 2005; Rice, 2007; Rost, 1997). This new leadership emphasizes a process-focused inclusiveness (Astin & Astin, 2000) in which individuals and their contributions are shared and appreciated. The change to relational leadership will increase leader opportunities in varied settings for the two generations of students currently enrolled in community colleges.

To prepare as leaders for the new leadership paradigm, individuals need to consider self as a leader and a person of influence (Outcalt, Faris, McMahon, Tahtakran, & Noll, 2001). A leader practice model of five exemplary practices as researched by Kouzes and Posner (1987, 2002) serves as the first framework in this study; participants will identify views of self as a leader on the two practices of "modeling the way" and

“enabling others to act”. The third body of studies focuses on the influences of generation, gender, and culture in developing a leader identity and a perception of leader attributes in others.

A leader identity requires developing a self-efficacy for the leadership process, creating a self-identity as a person of influence for change and common purpose (Astin, 1997; Hiller, 2005), and identifying prototypical leader attributes and role model behaviors. The second framework for this study is the reported recognition of leader traits in others. Research has shown that two initial steps in clarifying and acting on one’s own potential for becoming a leader and a responsible citizen (CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, 2003) and, in acknowledging differences (Arsenault, 2004; Paine, 2006) is influenced by two foundational processes of: (1) an early identification of leader attributes in self and others (Hall & Lord, 1995; Lord & Maher, 1991; Welch, 2000), and (2) recognition of modeling behaviors (Buford, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

This literature review will focus on the current organizational climate and identify recommended leadership preparation needed to meet personal and organizational outcomes. It will report how generational, gender, and ethnic influences may impact leader recognition, leader identity; and on cognitive research regarding what contributes to perceptions of leaders. Currently, little is written about the leadership views of the culturally diverse generation X and the millennial generation students while they are attending community college. This research study will contribute to what is known about the views of leader attributes in self and others in one multi-culturally diverse community college population.

Community College Mission

Workforce Preparation

Founded in 1901, community colleges have served as open access institutions that provide “post- secondary educational programs and services that lead to stronger, more vital communities” (Vaughan, 2000, p. 3). In a challenge essay entitled “Keeping America’s Promise: Challenges for Community Colleges,” the Director of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, Kay McClenney (2004) writes, “Opportunity in this country is more and more a function of education” (McClenney, 2004, p. 7). These words emphasize the importance for community college leaders to examine current realities as essential to setting a vision and restating commitment to educational opportunity. The current and projected demographic, socio-economic and workforce trends must be examined to identify if community colleges are serving the needs of students and community stakeholders.

Currently, there are needs for community colleges to (a) maintain open access for students who may transfer or attain an associate degree (Martinez, 2004); (b) address needs for first generation attendees (Wilson, 2004); (c) examine needs for services and programs for the nontraditional student; (d) provide programs for returning workers; (e) offer training and certification (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2004); (f) offer professional programs for meeting demands that may reflect workforce shortages; and (g) continue the mission for underprepared or underserved persons needing support to be successful in meeting educational goals (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009a; Goldbrick-Rab, Harris, Mazzeo, & Kienzl, 2009; Wilson, 2004).

In 2009, community college enrollments in 1,177 institutions accounted for over 44% of all United States undergraduate students. In the community college student population, the average age was 29, with 47% of students reported as age 21 or younger, and 40% of students reported as ages 22-39 years. In this population, 39% are reported as first generation college attendees; and 36% are reported as minorities (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009a).

According to the Educational Testing Service, from 1995-2015, the number of undergraduates qualified to attend colleges and universities in the United States will grow by 19 percent or 2.6 million students. This enrollment growth will bring a 31% increase in enrollment of older students. With higher immigration rates, 80% of the 2.6 million students will be minority students (Humphreys, 2000). Average annual tuition and fees are one-third of the average for four-year institutions (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009b), and, in challenging economic times, community colleges are positioned for additional increases in student enrollment numbers.

Researchers caution that in light of increasing numbers of diverse students, educational institutions need to address equity and acquire an inclusive learning environment for the benefit of all students (Humphreys, 2000) and stakeholders of the institution. In the current economic reality, community colleges need to be prudent while setting stimulating goals for innovative practices. These practices need to sustain or improve community college quality while serving the missions for transfer preparation, programs and credentialing for new and returning workers, and contributing to lifelong learning that is necessary in today's world.

With the changing demographics, as well as social, economic, and political influences, there will be an increased in demands for community colleges to prepare students for the realities of what will be required for the workplace of 2020 (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005). One workplace reality will be the varied lenses of diversity through which individuals view leaders and value leadership. Therefore, there is inherent value in identifying ways in which these values are considered and their impact has been acknowledged (Kezar, 2000).

Advocacy and financial support will need to be sought in addressing preparation in meeting workforce needs; ensuring standards for leader development for generations; closing perceived and projected gaps in attaining educational goal achievement; and preparing individuals as educated responsible citizens (Goldrick-Rab, Harris, Mazzeo, & Kienzl, 2009, p. 29). In acquiring the funding and setting the initiatives for innovative practices that will increase success, it is recommended that sub-baccalaureate education will require an effort for established relationships with state and local policy makers, philanthropic organizations, and experts within industry to implement integrative occupational and academic curricula that “must be shown to be researched-based in conception...” (Goldrick-Rab, et al., 2009, p. 25).

This proposed research study would elicit current generational and cultural views that may be applicable in initiating or improving relevant citizen and leader development opportunities. As an increasing entry point for higher and ongoing education, community colleges are poised to set an institutional priority for preparing students in self-identifying leader attributes (Northouse, 2004), earning a contributing voice (Kouzes & Posner, 2008), and beginning practice (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998). In an Association

of American Colleges and Universities initiative, President Carol Geary Schneider (2005) recommends that higher education leaders “shine a spotlight on what really matters in college, on the kinds of learning that truly empower today’s students to succeed and make a difference in the 21st century” (Schneider, 2005, p. 8).

Within the fifteen-year span from 2004-2019, the 60 million baby boomer generation members will be retiring from the workforce. A projected 45 million workers will be available to take their place, leaving a projected gap for leaders in many organizations and professions (Critchley, 2004), as well as a demand for employees who have practiced problem-solving, demonstrate an ability to work with teams, and possess leadership capabilities (Carnevale, Gainer & Meltzer, 1990).

In current times, with changing economic forces, the work environment has its challenges. While some individuals may stay in the workplace longer than expected, postindustrial leader positions may offer opportunity for young workers to be recruited and developed for contributions that meet short-term needs. In a ten-year study completed from 1993-2002, Tulgan and colleagues found trends that impacted the values and norms within the workplace. These trends included: (a) downsizing of jobs, (b) attitudes of less loyalty and fears for long term job security, (c) less hierarchical and more transactional employee-employer relationships, (d) declining confidence and expectations, and (e) supplanting of more traditional workplace values and norms. These trends are demanding and emphasize the need for prepared leaders and workers who will need marketable skills for decision-making, relationship building, and accepting and controlling what is occurring within the environment (Tulgan, 2004, p. 25).

During trying times, leader attributes “to be honest, forward looking, inspiring, and competent” (Kouzes and Posner, 2005, p. 359) are behaviors that aid in achieving leader credibility and strengthen a leader to assist others. Leader credibility is developed by finding a voice supported by values and core beliefs, communicating and listening respectfully to others, modeling behaviors consistent with values, and building a sense of community that nurtures others (Kouzes & Posner, 1990, 2005). The community college could be a setting for experiences that provide practice with building credibility as a basis for further development in other arenas (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Owen, & Fleishman, 2000).

As ongoing learners, students need the creation of a cognitive context for learning leadership skills from “three sources: trial and error, observations of others, and education” (Brown & Posner, 2001, p. 275). Researchers identify leader attributes as: (a) cognitive abilities with critical reasoning and creative thinking; (b) motivation and personality toward using power, information, and affiliation with others; (c) social intelligence with appropriate self-monitoring; and, (d) employing tacit knowledge in problem solving (Zaccaro, Kemp, Bader, 2004). Higher education leaders can view leadership development as developing human potential (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). New directions for student development include seeking the unique influences that contribute to fostering leadership capabilities (Vari, 2005), starting with developing a positive self-regard (Bennis & Nanus, 1997).

The preparation of future successful leaders incorporates the practice of conceptualizing self-efficacy as described in the work of Bandura (1986) in which it is identified “Among the types of thoughts that affect action, none is more central than

peoples' judgments of their capabilities to deal effectively with realities" (Bandura, 1986, p.21). Self-efficacy is self-influenced and self-judged cognitive and affective beliefs about capabilities. Self-efficacy contributes to an individual's motivated investment in actions and perseverance to produce an effect and meet performance outcome expectations and accomplishments, even while encountering difficulties (Bandura, 1997; Locke, 2000).

Bandura (1986, 1994) believes that self-efficacy strengthens an individual's (a) sense of capability; (b) ability to deal with realities and challenges; (c) ability to use strengths to self-promote; (d) ability to use behaviors and traits necessary to influence ones emotional responses; and (e) sense of producing effects. Self-efficacy provides strength for leaders to promote and accept differences of others and move toward positive outcomes. Qualitative studies have shown that effective leaders had a strong belief that they were capable of goal accomplishment.

These effective leaders viewed leadership through a prism of optimism and confidence in their capabilities and positive expectations for outcomes (Bennis & Nanus, 1997; Chemers, Watson, & May, 2000). The leader qualities of efficacy and a sense of confidence are internal processes (Chemers, et al. 2000) which lead to aspirations and motivation (Bandura, 1986), a tendency for perseverance, and sustaining motivation (Bandura & Cervone, 1983). Efficacy and confidence benefit individuals and the people with whom they work (Chemers, et al.). Efficacy qualities for influential leaders are acquired over time, are built from experiences of success, and are promoted by perceptions of others (Lord & Maher, 1991) with effective goal achievement (Astin & Astin, 1995; Chemers, et al.).

Preparation of Citizens

The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education calls for an educational environment that supports a holistic development of students with moral and civic education (Mable, 2007). This holistic approach, representative of the vectors of Chickering (1969), could conceivably be applied within the community college setting. These standards assist in creating a campus culture which supports student learning and development with co-curricular programs and services.

In this supportive culture, there are expectations for quality outcomes that empower students with leadership awareness, defined values, and improved communication. In this campus culture, students may also develop a sense of personal, civic, and socially engaged responsibility to self and others of diverse backgrounds (Mable, 2007). In 2004, James Banks proposed that basic citizenship education can prepare individuals to act on knowledge, skills, and attitudes that reflect values for just and equal decisions and are important in a diverse democracy (as cited in Hurtado, 2006, p. 190).

Hurtado (2006) suggests that citizenship preparation could be practiced through offering substantial opportunities for growth-producing interactions. Research findings show that college students who are prepared citizens may choose to serve as empowered persons of influence beyond college (Astin & Astin, 2000) and as social change agents (Higher Education Research Institute, 1996). Vaughan (2000) acknowledges while there is value to prepare students, there are implications to be addressed for the two groups of students that are distinguished by their role while in the community college setting. These roles are student-citizen and citizen-student.

First, there may be implications for student-citizens, in whom the main focus is on the student role while preparing for rights and responsibilities for a citizen role. Vaughan (2000) believes there is an expressed need for mentoring opportunities and increased involvement in leader opportunities either on campus or in limited work settings for student-citizens. Second, citizen-students “assume the rights and responsibilities that accompany full citizenship” (Vaughan, 2000, p. 13) which may require a different approach in offering leadership, social, and mentoring experiences to meet the needs of these students for gaining knowledge and practice. Pepicello (2009) cites statistics which indicate undergraduate students are less traditional and may (1) serve in roles that may interrupt college; (2) need to work to meet financial needs and support dependents; and (3) represent first generation college attendees. These factors may contribute to additional challenges for students and make it imperative that leaders in higher education attempt to understand the needs, motivations, and goals of students to determine ways to improve student success.

In 2009, of the students attending community college full time, 27% reported working full- time and 50% reported working part-time. In 2009, of the students attending community college part-time, 50% reported working full-time and 33% reported working part-time (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009a). Thirty-four percent reported dependents and 16% are single parents (Community College Survey of Student Engagement, 2003). In light of these statistics community college leaders may choose to take a new look at creating citizen and leader development opportunities that are relevant for today’s students.

There is evidence that student leadership development programs are successful in the preparation of graduates capable of leading a fulfilling life (Welch, 2000; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999) and advancing in a multi-cultural society as persons of influence. These programs include realistic self-appraisals, value clarification, goal setting, learning to appreciate other cultures, and learning to collaborate (Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2006; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2007).

As a community based institution, community colleges and the stakeholder partners are at an advantage to develop leaders with a sense of civic responsibility to lead in complex times (Astin & Sax, 1998; DeZure, 2008). Opportunities to enhance curricular and co-curricular experiences can be created with input and participation of the many community college stakeholders (Williams, 2001). These partnerships may include business and community leaders who may serve in new roles as mentors and educational partners. In participating, students may make and defend informed responsible decisions and view themselves as citizen-leaders and agents of influence and change (Astin & Astin, 2000; Bonsall, Harris, & Marczak, 2002).

Alexander Astin and Sax (1998) reported community experiences facilitated learning and skill acquisition, a sense of civic responsibility and leader development, and were shown to have long-term benefits to both students and those partners engaging them. While there is value for community colleges to enhance partnership opportunities; Bonsall, Harris, and Marczak (2002) recommend that college leaders ensure appropriately tailored experiences that reflect the values and realities of the community as

well as the student participants. Perhaps identifying the demographics and surveying the attitudes of participants could serve as a first step in program building efforts.

In preparing students for global citizenship, future workforce participation and service as future community leaders, the community college setting can foster and empower students in developing adaptive capacity, creating an informed voice, and engaging others with integrity (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Brint & Karabel, 1989). This role for community colleges was first recognized almost a century ago, in recommendations for these institutions of vocational training to provide an education for leadership needed to serve self and others responsibly (Brint & Karabel, 1989). While acknowledged a century ago, the recommendations serve as a timely reminder in light of the current challenges faced by community colleges. There needs to be a review of institutional priorities and data collection of critical performances that reflect student learning outcomes. In collecting data, an audit of the campus can be a part of a systematic process that identifies the student population and all the current opportunities for student development. This data can also be used in the planning and offering of relevant projects respectful of informal, formal, grounded, and newer theories of the leadership process (Boatman, 1999) and democratic self-governance (Brint & Karabel, 1989).

Institutional Benefits of Leader Development

Four-year institutions offer leader development programs for future, influential citizen-leaders preparing for formal or informal positions in varied settings; however, this is not a point of emphasis within the community college setting. Leader development programs within four-year institutions employ self-appraisal and attribute identification in role models as first measures in promoting cognitive and behavioral opportunities for

developing leaders (Hiller, 2005; Vari, 2005; Wilcox, 2004). During 2000-2006, the Association of American Colleges and Universities instituted an undergraduate initiative, Greater Expectations, which aims to identify innovative models and practices to improve undergraduate student learning and advocate for reform.

The Greater Expectations national panel, comprised of leaders from education, government, business, and communities made initial recommendations for high expectations, identified model-learning campuses, and focused on innovations that enhance student learning and engagement based on deliberate practices. The panel has continued to provide follow-up for all levels of undergraduate higher education (Greater Expectations Initiative, 2000, ¶ 2). One role of the Greater Expectations panel was to address the educational preparation needed for student success and social responsibility.

The panel has proposed that students become intentional learners who are responsible and develop self-awareness, take purposeful measures and actions, and apply information and knowledge to make connections and decisions. Students need to adapt skills and integrate knowledge to choose to act in ethical and responsible ways in the classroom, workplace, and their communities. Students need to be intentional in developing within diverse teams, and accept accountability for a self-identity based on value while respecting “complex identities of others, their histories, and their cultures” (Greater Expectations, 2000, ¶9).

Twenty-five years after it was first proposed, Ritchie and Hammond (2005) reiterated “students should become scholars; that learning has inherent value, that discovery and critical thinking are essential for the leaders of tomorrow” (Ritchie & Hammond, 2005, p. 6). According to these researchers, the students as well as the

educators will benefit from scholarly endeavors transferred into the classroom which may cause a shift to action and involvement rather than passive behaviors. The process begins with each individual taking a personal approach to actively participating and assuming responsibility for contributions.

When students develop attitudes toward active learning by being informed, maintaining competencies, and assuming self-responsibility, a stage is set for the development of values and participation needed in becoming leaders (Ritchie & Hammond, 2005). These actions and attitudes benefit students as empowering in making a difference and influencing others (Astin & Astin, 2000; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). The sense of empowerment may be supported by the culture promoted on college campuses.

In one study, Shertzer and Schuh (2004) studied empowering and constraining beliefs held by college students. College students reported that they valued the college environment that was post-industrial and supportive and that offered engaging, inclusive opportunities. These researchers recommend that college leaders assess leadership attitudes and perceptions of students on their campus. Thereafter, the college environment promoting more opportunities and increasing the number of students participating needs to be created (Shertzer & Schuh, 2004). In a growth producing college environment, students may feel more empowered in their own leadership capabilities (Astin & Astin, 2000).

Increasing opportunities, creating a culture on campus, and empowering students for success are relevant actions to foster students to become effective members of a competitive, higher order skilled workforce. Additionally, these are relevant to fostering students as global citizens who accept responsibility for citizenship and influence

(VanHecke, 2008; Welch, 2000). A community college that chooses to assess students' beliefs accepts the accountability for the development of talent (Astin, 1991), and a willingness to build a culture of evidence pertinent to strategic goals (McClenney, 2004).

A Changing Nature of Leadership

In the 21st century, the nature of leadership is changing (Raelin, 2005; Rost, 1993, 1997). The changing socio-economic and demographic trends, global perspectives and capabilities, marketing changes and competition, and technological proliferation (Critchley, 2004; Kezar, 2000; Schettler, 2003) have impacted organizations, causing them to adopt a leadership paradigm that meets organizational needs and outcomes. In many organizations, these changes brought a shift from an industrial to a post-industrial approach to leadership.

Appropriate to the time, the industrial approach was a functionally structured means to accomplish goals by formally appointed organizational leaders or managers who had the responsibility and power for job completion. It was utilitarian, linear or hierarchical in nature, dominated by quantitative goal achievement and was prominent in western society during the 19th and 20th centuries (Rost, 1997). Examining the industrial approach to leadership, Rost (1993, 1997) noted it was leader-centric, individualistic, and emphasized what the leader does as defining good leadership.

Rost (1997) developed a theory for movement toward a post-industrial relationship centered paradigm. Based on relationships, this paradigm views the leader as a collaborator who works within a leader-collaborator context, employing multidirectional influences for real changes and for mutual goals and purpose. Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) propose that a post-industrial or less traditional vision of

leadership is supported by the “truths” of leadership defined by recognizing that (a) leadership is a discipline that is able to be taught and (b) leadership occurs at all levels.

In the post-industrial period, a newer paradigm for leader behaviors presumes that leaders act as effective change agents who influence others (Astin, 1997). As leaders, they prefer collaborative efforts to accomplish goals (Raelin, 2005; Rost, 1997) and choose to use power that effects successful outcomes, aids in achievement and involves a moral purpose (Antonakis, Cianciolo, & Sternberg, 2004). This collaboration can be deliberately constructed to allow others to arrive at mutually considered and respected decisions or actions. According to Rice (2007) collaboration can build coalitions while transforming the group from individuals with single purpose to an empowered group respectful of the shared contributions and diversity.

Raelin (2005) chose the term *leaderful* [*sic*] for behaviors that are endorsed when a formal or informal leader practices concurrent, collective, collaborative, and compassionate behaviors. These behaviors effect empowerment, increase performance and productivity, employ genuine management, elevate trust, and create opportunity for contributions of each member within a culture or organization. In many settings, leader practices are being redefined and practiced with emphasis on collaboration, individual contribution, and concurrent responsibility (Raelin, 2005).

In a 2005 report from the Center for Creative Leadership, Martin (2005) shared research on the reports of 300 organizational representatives. Two-thirds of the respondents were representatives of the United States and one-third were global respondents representing 28 countries. In identifying the current and five-year projections for challenges to leadership, more than 84% of respondents indicated a changing

definition of effective leadership from the previous five years; and 58% stated interdependent work is now the foundation for effective leadership. From the responses, three outcomes believed central for effective leadership are setting direction, building commitment, and creating alignment. When asked to highlight the current organizational challenges, respondents chose investment in individual leadership and organizational culture as activities that would improve organizational abilities to meet new challenges and opportunities.

Martin (2005) also found that respondents viewed leading employees, building and mending relationships, dealing with change, and employing participative management as important skills for the future. In addition, respondents believed organizations will continue to move toward leadership as a process of interdependent decision-making, developing individual's leadership, and encouraging networking competencies. The global respondents reported a changing future for leadership which is less individual, more collective, and a boundary-less process that will happen throughout the organization (Martin, 2005, p. 14).

Recognizing there is value to "connected leadership," researchers from the Center for Creative Leadership surveyed organizations to identify leadership development goals and the approach most likely to result in effective leadership. Schettler (2003) reports that respondents in 47% of the organizations indicated they focus on groups or teams to a great or very great extent; team building is a very valued skill with 59% reporting team capabilities as leadership goals. Many opportunities for developing relationships and connections between individuals, groups or teams were also reported. These opportunities

included assessing and developing individual leader competencies, creating future leadership strengths, developing leadership strategies, and enhancing relationships.

In this millennium, one-half of the workers of the United States will work in empowered, self-managed teams. Preparation for these workplace teams will require increased emphasis on broad skill sets for (a) acceptance of ongoing learning; (b) critical thinking for problem-solving; (c) effective communication and listening skills; (d) an understanding of group and organizational work; and (e) leading in ways that include respecting peers and projecting a vision (Carnevale, Gainer, & Meltzer, 1990).

Exemplary Leadership Practices

Research of Kouzes and Posner

In preparation for the changing paradigm to collaborative and relational leadership and with increasing opportunities to serve as a leader in formal and informal positions, community college students could benefit from identifying leader capabilities they currently possess. In completing this proposed research survey, students will report self-attributes for leader behaviors as representatives from their cultural backgrounds of generation, gender, and ethnicity. Twenty-five years of research has prompted researchers Kouzes and Posner to state “leader development is self-development” (Kouzes & Posner, 2008, p. 2) and that there is value to serving as a leader who brings out one’s own personal best.

In 1987, Kouzes and Posner identified that leadership is founded by a strong belief in a purpose, a willingness to assume the challenge of learning and developing oneself, and investing in the long-term development of others. Kouzes and Posner (1987, 2002) report exemplary leaders establish and sustain credibility and commitment to

relationships. The current leadership environments demand leader awareness and acknowledgment of changing personal, social and workforce factors. These factors may be viewed as opportunities as well as challenges (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

To acknowledge and strengthen oneself as a leader and prepare for opportunities, Kouzes and Posner (2002) recommend five exemplary leadership behaviors. They are (1) “modeling the way”, which involves finding a voice and setting an example; (2) “inspiring a shared vision”, which involves envisioning possibilities and enlisting others in a common vision; (3) “challenging the process”, which involves searching for growth opportunities and taking risks; (4) “enabling others to act”, which involves fostering collaboration and strengthening others; and (5) “encouraging the heart”, which involves appreciating contributions and creating a community spirit (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2008).

In order to identify the community college student’s views on leader self-attributes, the emphasis for this study will be the two exemplary leadership practice behaviors of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act”. The practice of “modeling the way” is represented by value clarification, finding a voice, advocating, setting an example that is aligned with values and beliefs, and choosing involvement (Kouzes & Posner, 2008). The practice of “enabling others to act” involves fostering collaboration and co-operation, building trust, strengthening others, and developing confidence and competence (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

The first leadership practice behaviors are behaviors for “modeling the way”. As a part of developing modeling behaviors, an individual uses a reflective process to clarify values and examine assumptions. The individual then applies assumptions and values in

choosing a guide for communicating and aligning authentic action that is consistent with values. Kouzes and Posner (2008) state that values held by an individual serve as a moral compass. Their theory states that values have enduring worth to an individual in developing a belief system and choosing actions toward goals deemed important, especially valuable during challenges and difficult situations.

This compass also serves as a guide that assists in setting boundaries, making decisions, and recommitting to what is valued. These clarified values influence moral judgments, commitments, and responses for self as an individual and the manner in which an individual influences others (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 48). Clarified values become operational when making commitments, setting goals, keeping motivated, and accepting the voice to communicate these values (Kouzes & Posner, 2008; Stanford-Blair & Dickmann, 2005). The articulation and defense of values, beliefs, and principles with an authentic voice is part of a process for earning and maintaining credibility (Kouzes & Posner, 2008).

The second behaviors for “modeling the way” are behaviors that set an example. This practice is performed when an individual attempts actions to the best of his/her ability and aligns these actions with one’s own values and standards (Kouzes & Posner, 2008). People who “model the way” and set an example, create a supportive climate for promoting the aligned values and commitment of others. Identifying core values and promoting their performance creates a coherent capacity for forging a “social, emotional, and reflective leadership influence on others” (Stanford-Blair & Dickmann, 2005, p.122). In community colleges, leader development has the potential to provide opportunities for students to practice the processes of “modeling the way”. The leader development

process could be enhanced by being involved as a participative citizen (Rost & Barker, 2000) who is employing reflection and value clarification, practicing actions of finding and sharing a voice, and setting an example (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, 2008).

The first behaviors for “enabling others to act” involve the leader looking to others in a collaborative effort to accomplish goals. This collaboration recognizes diverse ideas, facilitates positive regard, and offers a non-competitive interdependence that builds trust among the team, (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The initial step in collaboration is to build trust and create a culture of respect and trust.

In one study completed with members of high trust groups, participants reported the ability to be open about their feelings, experienced clarity about problems and goals, and contributed to solutions and courses of action. In addition, the members reported greater levels of motivation and mutual influence (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 248). Interpersonal trust can also be encouraged by leaders who use their own voice to disclose values, needs, and to model actions while developing listening and social skills to become aware of the values, interests, and needs of others. These behaviors set forth the foundation for relationships built on cooperation and collaboration (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

The leader behaviors to strengthen others are the second behaviors to “enable others to act”. The process of strengthening others involves providing positive engagement, supporting self-leadership opportunities, and creating a sense of empowerment. According to Kouzes and Posner (2002), a leader can create an enriched, growth-producing, learning environment by respecting and supporting the strengths and contributions of others which may also contribute to increased confidence and

competence of others (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). These behaviors for leader development and relational leadership described by Kouzes and Posner (1987, 2002) and Brown and Posner (2001), are compatible with the student development theory of Chickering (1969).

Chickering (1969) proposed that students develop individual self-regard in seven different areas that he called vectors. These vectors are cycles for integration and differentiation in (1) developing holistic competence through meeting challenges and stepping outside what one knows; (2) managing emotions and trust while accepting consequences; (3) developing an autonomy while acting interdependently and assertively; (4) forming an identity by completing a self-appraisal and defining core values; (5) creating freeing interpersonal relationships by evoking empathy for issues and values of others; (6) developing purpose including setting own goals and direction; and (7) developing integrity that is congruent with words and actions.

The Leadership Practices Inventory

In 1987, Posner and Kouzes developed a leadership practice paradigm to create a framework for examining the leadership behaviors and gaining a better understanding of the process and growth in becoming a leader. A triangulation of qualitative research including in-depth interviews and case studies, and quantitative research was administered to over 1,200 managers across disciplines to assess their reports of “personal best” leader experiences. Themes were also developed that created the five leader behaviors “model the way”, “inspire a shared vision”, “challenge the process”, “enable others to act”, “encourage the heart” (Posner, 2002, *The Leadership Practice Inventory: Theory and Evidence Behind the Five Practices of Exemplary Leaders*).

In a recent landmark study, Posner (2009) reported age, gender, and ethnicity results of respondents self-reporting to an online survey for the five leadership practice behaviors. The reports on the two behaviors used in this research study were noted in the Posner findings. Posner (2009) states “All ANOVA comparisons between respondents by their age group were statistically different ($p < .001$) for all five leadership practices. Generally as respondents age increased so did the frequency of their use of each of the leadership practices” (Posner, 2009, p. 21). By gender, the leadership practices for “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” had higher reports of practice for female than male respondents. The *t*-test and ANOVA comparisons were statistically different between all “people of color” and Caucasians on all five leadership practices (Posner, 2009, p. 22).

Researchers have, or are currently, employing this inventory, to measure leadership domain alone and with other measures in experimental and non-experimental settings and organizations. Studies completed within institutions of higher learning have compared data on pre-and post- Leadership Practice Inventory scores for participants who completed leader development programs or participated in extra-curricular initiatives. The results indicate respondents benefitted from learning and applying the five exemplary leader behaviors. The following three studies were chosen for discussion as there is relevance to this community college leader development research: a community college study that provided community service opportunities and extra-curricular activities (Binard & Brungardt, 1997), a study with a short term leader institute (Pugh, 2000), and a study on the development of student self-efficacy (Endress, 2000).

Binard and Brungardt (1997) employed the Leadership Practice Inventory in a community college setting. Students who attended workshops, participated in one or more leadership activities on campus, and served in community service were assessed to identify if curricular and co-curricular strategies improved leader behaviors. Although the sample was small, the majority of the students reported two semesters of participation in leadership development activities were beneficial to their leadership development.

Pugh (2000) completed a research study of college students who were invited to participate in a six-day leadership development institute. Reports of gains in three of the five exemplary practice behaviors for challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, and encouraging the heart were noted on the post-survey distribution. This study utilized the Student Leadership Practices Inventory to gather data from the 51 participants. In light of the gains noted in a short-term, there was some evidence to suggest interventions in short-term institutes and programs may impact student leadership development.

Endress (2000) modified the student leadership practice inventory to examine pre- and post- scores for leader self-efficacy. Participants were in a semester long leadership class, involved in co-curricular activities and employed on campus. Findings showed the participants, regardless of race or age, were aided by the participation in the leadership class as shown on the post-test with higher scores for the five exemplary behaviors. Women's self-efficacy scores for relational leadership were found to be higher.

Influences in Leadership Identity

Generational Membership

A generation is the aggregate of all people born in the span of a phase of life, generally 20 years, who share a common location in history, and a collective persona

(Strauss and Howe, 1997). A grouping of generations has been used to locate the place in time of individuals but may also be used for identifying the significance and contributions of each generation (Pilcher, 1994). Mannheim wrote that generations are historically determined and forged by common events with members who share “a common location in the social and historical process” predisposing them to certain modes of thought and action (as cited in Vaidhyanathan, 2008)

As a generational member, there is implied belonging and an orientation to each other (Pilcher, 1994). Pilcher suggests a term to refer to individuals within a cohort group as a “social generation”, a definition carried from the work of Mannheim in recognizing the work of generations as significant for promoting social change. Due to what was valued within the political climate, Mannheim (1928; 1952) a sociologist, outlined that generational age groups were expected to act as social change agents and use intellectual and organizational alternatives to challenge the status quo as “agencies of change” (as cited in Pilcher, 1994, p. 491). This recognizes Mannheim’s acknowledgement that “our organic existence has effects...which permeate the social world” (Pilcher, 1994, p. 485).

For the social generation X and millennial generation cohorts, decades of research have been completed by Strauss and Howe who identify generational cohorts as groups related to political and historical events known as “epochal events” (Strauss & Howe, 1991, p. 32). These events impact an individual in formative periods of life and serve as a generational location. In addition to an historical context and location, there is a significant collective self-image or persona, and a belief in generational destiny demonstrated as its “direction of change” (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p. 17). This direction of change is determined by a generation’s perceptions and attitudes about roles and

family, culture and religion, institutions and politics, and the future (Howe & Strauss, 2000).

Howe and Strauss (2000) identify three attributes that create a generational persona. First, a generation shares occurrences and events at a common time in history. These are represented by regional and global events, trends, issues, and impacts that are (a) economic and political; (b) social and cultural; (c) family and institutional; and (d) technological and environmental. Second, a generation has perceived membership, which is believed to occur as one matures throughout adolescence into adulthood while experiencing time marked by memorable events. The membership allows the individuals to have a generational persona which is revealed in work, service, career and personal lives. Third, a generation has the common beliefs and behavioral expectations held by the cohorts within the generation (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p. 43). These beliefs become the basis for current and future attitudes and expectations toward (a) family, gender roles, lifestyle; (b) social, political, religious, cultural; and (c) institutional arenas.

In an interview sharing insights on the millennial cohorts with applicability to generation X cohorts, William Strauss identified the process of generational change. As agents of change, members of the incoming generations (1) desire to correct perceived behaviors of the dominant parent group; (2) believe that they are in line to solve the problems of the previous generation; and (3) desire to step up to the social roles from a perceived or real void that is being created from the passing generation (Lowery, 2001). This theory of process for change purports that provisions are made for appropriate experiences for generation X and the millennial generation cohorts to reflect, examine, and practice for a maximized ability to perform as change agents.

Although researchers recommend mining data on beliefs and behaviors of generations, a cautionary note against generalized identification and oversimplified approaches to interpreting these behaviors should be recognized. The use of generalizations may result in lessening true understanding toward generational differences and inhibit the recognition of the needs of the respective members (Vaidhyanathan, 2008). Whittington (2008) suggested that social class, gender, ethnicity, and different cultural perspectives may alter the impressions made in the formative years, creating a differing experience and interpretation of events. In place of assumptions about cohort membership, there needs to be an examination of validated differences and recognition for each individual's attributes (Arsenault, 2004; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998).

Researchers identify that a generational persona creates a perspective for attitudes, values, and preferences toward an individual's leader and leadership preferences (Arsenault, 2004; Howe & Stauss, 2000; Martin & Tulgan, 2002, 2004). Generational differences result in leadership preferences and attitudes toward organizations and work life (Arsenault, 2004; Dulin, 2008; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998; Kezar, 2000; Tulgan, 2004) and the conceptualization of leaders (Raelin, 2005; Rost, 1997). There is a belief "that the different core attitudes and values of generations often are the most important diversity determinants of workplace behavior" (Meredith, Schewe, & Hiam, 2002, as cited in Arsenault, 2004, p. 137).

This research study will report responses of representatives from two generations of students from multi-cultural and diverse socio-economic backgrounds representing 26 communities. The purpose of this study is to report the data that examines if differences exist in the students views about self and others as a leader. These findings will provide

data for dialogue and may serve useful for data-driven decisions pertinent to leader development within the community college.

Generation X cohorts.

The students of generation X are age 29-49, born in 1961 through 1981 and in 2008 there were 46 million members of this generation (Gibson, 2007). This group comprises just 20% of the United States population, compared to the previous baby boomer generation, who comprise 41% of the share (Catalyst, 2001). Identified as the best educated generation, the 2005 United States Census reported approximately 60 % of generation X members, or over six million men and seven million women, reported attending some college, with more than seven million men and over eight million women earning an associate or bachelor degree (NAS, 2006).

The elder members of the generation X have been participating within the workforce for over 25 years (Martin & Tulgan, 2006); however leadership trait studies have not included generation X member participation (Rodriquez, Green, & Ree, 2003). However, preferences of generation X toward work life views and expectations have been examined (Gerkovich, 2001). Generation X members prefer challenging tasks that can be accomplished in the short term while being allowed to work alone with flexible hours and Internet access. They prefer a challenging work environment which is significantly different from the baby boomer generation respondents; with no significant differences across ethnicities (Rodriquez, Green, & Ree, 2003).

Generation X members may have become accustomed to growing up in homes with a single parent or two working parents and may have felt financial, family and social insecurities (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Smola & Sutton, 2002). Upon entering the

workforce, generation X members were affected by a rapidly changing, diverse environment with a changing psychological contract that promised fewer long-term rewards (Smola & Sutton, 2002). As a result, generation X members adapted to the work environment by preferring short-term rewards with fewer long term expectations (Martin & Tulgan, 2006; Paine, 2006), an attitude toward individualism and self-reliance, and a perception of self as a free agent (Families and Work Institute, 2002; Martin & Tulgan, 2006; Smola & Sutton, 2002).

When surveyed, generation X respondents identified preferences to collaborative and relational leadership; however, they expressed conditions to choosing more active leadership opportunities for themselves (Bishop, 2004). Additional research indicates that members of generation X predominately support seeking life-work balance (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Catalyst, 2001; Tulgan, 2000) and have a high priority for their job and family (Families and Work Institute, 2002). They thrive in a workplace that is flexible and appreciate freedom of choice and project completion, viewing leaders as necessary coaches or mentors (Steele & Gordon, 2006). They respect mentors for feedback but do not want them to inhibit creativity or job completion (Martin & Tulgan, 2006).

Generation X approaches job completion by a means referred to as reality management indicating that the work is completed according to their timetable with less traditional work hour emphasis (Steele & Gordon, 2006). It may be valuable to acknowledge that from the time generation X members arrived in the workforce, they have been impacted by economic, organizational (Martin & Tulgan, 2006), psychological (Paine, 2006), and societal factors. These workforce factors may have an effect on the values of those entering, maintaining, or considering positions including leader roles.

Millennial Generation cohorts.

The millennial students are age 28 or younger, born in or after 1982. These students are referred to as the “millennials” because of their entry into college at the turn of the millennium (Critchley, 2004). In 2007 there were 76 million members of the millennial generation (Gibson, 2007) compared in size to the baby boomer generation which had held the largest number of cohort members reaching 80 million in 2008 (Howe & Strauss, 2000). With the new millennium, the newest generation came of age to represent and define its generation, bringing expectations, characteristics and values into the institutions of higher learning.

There are inconsistencies in the literature for the birth years and generational name for the millennial generation cohort. Many researchers and organizational recruiters choose a four to five year difference for birth years starting in 1977 or 1978 and spanning 15 or 20 years. Many refer to this generation as generation Y while in the workplace. For this research study, the generational categories were chosen from the literature of Howe and Strauss (2000) which define the millennial members as those born in or after 1982.

The millennial cohorts are the most racially and ethnically diverse generation. In 1999, nonwhites and Latinos accounted for 35.5% of the 18 or under population. Researchers Howe and Strauss (2000) report that one millennial in five has at least one immigrant parent and one in ten has at least one noncitizen parent. Potentially they are the second largest second-generation immigrant group in eighty years.

Howe and Strauss (2000) state the status of having immigrant parents may present both challenges such as socio-economic hardships; as well as rewards demonstrated in motivation or work ethic that represents and protects the family. Howe and Strauss

suggest that millennial generation members may possess a more expansive understanding of race and nationalities. In addition, with the use of the Internet, instant communications, and changing worldviews, this generation tends to view themselves as “global” (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p.16).

According to Raines (2002), millennial generation cohorts are characteristically fair, inclusive, and respectful of diversity. They are confident, goal oriented and achieving, civic and team oriented, and consider themselves as hopeful while remaining conventional. Currently, the millennial generation members are entering and contributing in the workplace. Dulin (2008) reports research indicating they are noted to seek a work-life balance, share ideas, and prefer to collaborate with leaders who actively listen and clearly communicate. These millennial cohorts, referred to as generation Y cohorts in the workplace, enjoy and benefit from ongoing learning and opportunities for growth, especially guided by mentors and leaders. Rice (2007) indicates that members of this generation are able to multi-task, look to mentors for additional guidance and structure, utilize collaboration, value diversity and possess a global mentality.

The characteristics of the millennial students will have an impact on their career choices and actions (Arsenault, 2004; Howe and Strauss 2000). According to Howe and Strauss (2000), the millennial members question the values and behaviors of their parents. Many people, including the millennial generation members themselves could discover “that they are the next generation from whom much is expected” (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p. 353).

However, Howe and Strauss (2000) caution that the membership numbers and cultural diversity within the millennial generation cohort may lessen a generational

persona. This generation is meeting with conflicting social, economic, geographic, and societal issues. The result may be fragmentation based on lifestyle, income, race and ethnicities. Hurtado (2006) calls on leaders in higher education to recognize the needs of the generations and intervene to promote equity of opportunity.

Generational research is being completed on four generations: silent, baby boomer, generation X and millennials, currently within organizations and industry (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Critchley, 2004; Rodriguez, Green, & Ree, 2003). Some of the challenges of a multi-generational workplace may be addressed by defining differences and beginning the understanding of what each generation values and needs (Paine, 2006). There may be value in recognizing and appreciating cross-generations as networks that utilize each individual's strengths and contributions (Smola & Sutton, 2002).

There is a gap in research on the leader views within the generations X and millennial generation population while attending college; therefore, little is known about the cultural implications of generational membership. In light of the community college mandate for preparation of educated persons and social reformers with leader qualities, research is needed to identify views and self-reported attributes in these two increasingly diverse generations.

Gender Diversity

Gender perceptions are an important aspect of culture that is relevant to leadership. As reported in June 2009, there are 68 million women who hold positions in the workforce including those who work in private and agricultural work or are self-employed. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects that by 2016, women will account for 49% or greater of workforce participants (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). As of 2008,

the largest percentage of women (39%), reported working in management, professional, and related occupations.

Four-year institutions have provided data on women and their responses to leadership development (Astin & Leland, 1991; Carless, 1998; Groves, 2005; Smith, 2005). Alexander Astin and Leland (1991) reported on research that indicated women view leadership differently from men. Women prefer interpersonal and reciprocal relationships as well as participatory and empowering leader styles.

Smith (2005) completed a post-graduate follow-up case study with women who participated in an undergraduate leadership development program. The respondents emphasized the need for more women to lead, and learn to lead. The women reported that the leadership development program improved their understanding of their own value, developed self-efficacy, and improved appreciation of diversity in others.

Data are also available from organizational studies that report women's views and leadership skills (Eagly, 1987; George, 2000; Groves, 2005; Rice, 2007). In a research study assessing gender differences from multiple perspectives, Carless (1998) found that superiors and managers rated female managers as more transformational than their male counterparts. In addition, the female managers perceived themselves as higher in the interpersonal and transformational behaviors than did their male counterparts.

According to Rice (2007) women reported a preference for communication that included the use of emotional and nurturing communication to bring others together, listening to all voices, and enacting transformational collaboration. According to Riggio (1986), women have a tendency and skill to communicate in both a verbal and non-verbal manner, characterized by social and emotional awareness toward others. These

communication capabilities contribute to strong relationships that may lead to improved goal achievement (George, 2000), and interpersonal skills which recognize members and their needs (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

Some studies have concluded that women have stronger social and emotional competencies than men (Groves, 2005; Riggio, 1986). In a research study assessing gender differences in social; emotional skills; and charismatic leadership, Groves (2005) identified that women scored higher than did their male counterparts on dispositions toward social control, expressivity and communication, and playing various roles. Groves (2005) recommended further research in the recognition and development of the skill sets for social and emotional competencies.

In a meta-analysis on gender and leadership preferences, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that women prefer a more democratic leadership style than men. This democratic style employs participation and collaboration. The factors contributing to this preferred style for women may include the woman's tendency for interpersonal orientation, superior social skills, or as a perceived or internalized bias toward women about their capabilities. These researchers suggested a postindustrial environment, which is less hierarchical and more collaborative, may support democratic leadership for both genders with less gender bias (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

Cultural Diversity

For the purpose of this research, the definition of culture includes generation and gender cultures within "an integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thoughts, communications, actions, customs, beliefs, values, and institutions of racial, ethnic, religious, or social nature" (Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & deLeon Siantz, 2008, p. 144).

Ethnicity refers to a social construct in which group members self-identify and share commonality with others (Cohen, 1978) through a heritage, language, ancestry, or traditions. Organizational environments are reporting the use of culturally diverse teams (Combs, 2002; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998) and identify value for individuals to “transcend the limits of their own perspectives” (Kezar, 2000, p. 11). According to Kezar (2000), this transcendence can be facilitated by identifying what is valued, reflecting and developing self-awareness, and displaying empathy and openness to others.

Much has been written about the impact of cultural diversity within organizations, institutions, and social arenas (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Martin, 2005; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Researchers are now examining the implications of multicultural campus environments for campus leaders (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005; Hurtado, 2006; Kezar, 2000). In examining the multicultural campus environment and aligning leader development opportunities, community college leaders follow a recommendation as “providers who have a professional and ethical responsibility to train leaders with competencies to lead across cultures” (Chemers, 1993, p. 295).

Ethnicity

Ethnicity is one encompassing term which relates to the varied cultures within a diverse society. Community college attendees represent changing populations led by increasing high immigration levels since the decade of 1960 when there was a rapid growth of Hispanic and Asian race populations. There were 1.6 million European born persons entering the United States in the decade of 1990-2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, special tabulations). The impact of this increased immigration has resulted in one of five children being either foreign born or with one foreign born parent

(Population Reference Bureau, 2007). The diverse constituencies are represented in many previously homogenous organizations and institutions. Rice (2007) suggested insight may be gained by identifying a “social location” which is defined by cultural backgrounds and impacts an individual’s views, perceptions, responses and contributions.

Many community college students will serve in leader roles and work with diverse groups that include non-Hispanic whites over age 60 and increasing Hispanic, Asian, and biracial populations. These groups are projected to increase in numbers of aging populations over the next 25 years (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010). According to Markus and Kitayama (1991) ethnic cultural identity has influence and implications for the cognition, emotion, and motivation of individuals.

Markus and Kitayama (1991) support the view that ethnic culture influences the constructs created by an individual and are relevant to an implicit, normative behavior of the independent self. Strong cultural constructs affect how individuals view attributes in self and aid in determining self-motivation and behaviors as a consequence of these internal attributes. These constructs also impact views of the interdependent self and affect relationships with others and the interdependence within relationships (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

These constructs influence a sense of social and relational connectedness. In some cultures, the connectedness and sense of interdependence is believed to be more common and is often reflected in respect, empathy and concern, sharing and reciprocity, and dependency for belonging (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). As a consequence of cultural view, an individual may demonstrate a greater self-control, willingness for positive flexibility, and a change of public behaviors. Cultural views may also exert an emotional

focus for others over self within interdependent relationships. Cultural implications are also present in motivation toward work, preference for leaders, and value for a strong sense of obligation toward a leader (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

With the postindustrial approach to leadership, there will be increasing opportunities for multi-cultural students of both generations to fulfill leader behaviors in varied settings. The changing demographics create a need to actively engage students in developing self-awareness and acquiring an understanding of others to facilitate effective collaborating or leading (Garza, 2000).

Role Models and Mentors

In the process of student development and achievement toward full capabilities, there is value in profiling and recognizing attributes in role models and mentors who exemplify leader capabilities (Buford, 2001; Mello, 2003; Rubin, 2000; Vari, 2005). Martin and Tulgan (2006) stated the millennial and generation X members report that there is value to college and workplace role models and mentors. These role models and mentors may have different attributes based on their own cultural lenses from which they view leaders and the influential work of leadership. Responding to a call for new practices, member institutions of the Association of American Colleges and Universities set an initiative for “an academy that systematically leverages diversity for student learning and institutional excellence” (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2006, p.6).

Trait Theory

Lord and Emrich (2001) stated what followers think and how they view leaders is important in a relationship and researched the contributions of individual, dyadic and collective cognition in the leadership process. For the purposes of this study, the

background and perspective of leadership as a trait rather than a process may facilitate understanding of the respondents' views of leader traits from a non-contextual perspective. The research data elicited from the Ratings of Leadership Traits list will identify a respondent's perspective on personal, skill, and physical characteristics they distinguish in leaders.

Trait theories have been studied as a basis for leadership for centuries, having an origin for describing virtues and qualities of wise men, heroes, and "great man" while envisioning ideals, wisdom, and reasoning in persons of power throughout civilizations (Bass, 1985; Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004). In the early past century, Terman (1904) reported on empirical studies completed with school age children aimed to identify which traits distinguish leaders from non-leaders. These reports contributed to a foundation for later research on prototypical traits of leaders (Zaccaro, et al. 2004) and implicit theories of leadership. Subsequent trait theories focused on innate qualities in political and social leaders to assist in identifying if there were specific, universal traits that distinguished leaders from non-leaders (Bass, 1985; Schriesheim & Bird, 1979) and if characteristics identified leaders from others (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991).

The trait approach stresses the value of leaders and may aid an individual in performing as a person of influence. If a leader is perceived to possess specific traits, the value of a leader may be underlined within the dyad or group. Trait theory data also identifies and benchmarks necessary performance traits an individual can develop or strengthen (Northouse, 2004) within the leader development process.

Research is being completed to identify leader trait perceptions and if personality traits may predict potential leader behaviors. Keller (1999) examined an individual's

personality traits and perceived parental traits as influences in selecting implicit leader traits. Implicit leadership theories can be seen as prototypes or ideal characteristics. The perception of these ideals sets a stimulus to activate the leadership schema causing perceivers to act or respond. A response uses a retrieval which occurs from organized hierarchical categories created in and stored in long term memory; assistive to an individual to select and interpret consistent information from these related categories. Perceivers may also use information held in short term memory (Keller, 1999; Lord & Maher, 1991). Responses may be idealized or an individualized positive self-image that is projected by the perceiver.

Keller (1999) found an individual's personality traits and perceived parental traits influence the perceiver responses to idealized leadership. Parental or familial traits are implicit leadership constructs in which idealized leadership mirrors perceived parent traits as exemplars of behavior that are perceived as socially acceptable traits. Based on these findings, further research of self-perceptions and self-projected personality traits, as well as perceived ideal parental traits, may be useful in determining contributions to a leadership identity.

Recognizing that cultural influences have been shown to affect the conceptualization of leadership; researchers examined if there are cross-cultural differences in leadership prototypes that are relevant for leader behaviors and expectations. The researchers of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) initiative aimed to identify if there is universal endorsement for attributes contributing to charismatic and transformational leadership. Testing the

hypothesis that there would be universal endorsement for attributes that contributed to outstanding leadership, the researchers studied 62 cultures.

Data was obtained and analyzed for attributes that are universally endorsed as positive, negative, and culturally contingent. The research findings supported the hypothesis that there were strongly and universally endorsed attributes across the cultures. All cultures viewed integrity, defined by the attributes of trustworthy, just and honest, as contributing to outstanding leadership (DenHartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999, ¶49).

The attributes endorsed as positive were identified in the research as: motive arouser, encouraging, communicative, trustworthy, dynamic, positive, confidence builder, and motivational (DenHartog, et al., 1999, ¶ 88). Respondents also reported culturally endorsed attributes. The culturally contingent attributes were reported as: enthusiastic, risk-taking, ambitious, willful, self-efficacy, unique, self-sacrificial, sincere, sensitive, and compassionate (DenHartog, et al., ¶52).

Universally viewed ineffective or impediments to outstanding leadership, reported as negative attributes, were identified as: loner, ruthless, non-explicit, non-cooperative, irritable, and dictatorial (DenHartog, et al. ¶ 51). The culturally contingent attributes that could be perceived as negative were reported: individualistic, sensitive, status conscious, ambitious, and cunning (DenHartog, et al. ¶ 53). Data analysis also indicated there were culturally contingent negatives to charisma so it was not universally endorsed; however, there were no impediments or negative attributes that describe transformational leadership.

In presenting the results, the researchers (a) reported effective leader attributes as well as impediments to outstanding leadership; (b) proposed value to the raising of awareness to multi-cultural views possessed by effective leaders; (c) specified what is valued when seeking desired outcomes that address and transcend the needs of participants while serving in an influential transformational process; (d) recognized leadership fit between perceiver's implicit ideas about "what leaders are"; and (e) proposed the need for empirical grounded theory to explain leaders and leader behaviors across cultures (DenHartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999).

Research of Lord and Colleagues

Dr. Robert Lord and colleagues have dedicated their research to developing and refining an integrated, comprehensive theory of the perceptions and performance that contributes to successful outcomes in the leadership process (Lord & Maher, 1991). For Lord and Maher, (1991), the most significant aspect of a leader-follower relationship is one in which an individual is perceived by the other as a leader. Summarizing the findings of research, Lord and Maher (1991) state that perceiver constructs of traits, behaviors, and events and the meaningful way perceivers utilize these constructs are important in explaining leadership perceptions (p. 32). House and Aditya (1997) acknowledged the research of Lord and colleagues in examining the Implicit Leadership Theory and the implications for the cognitive processes an individual uses in the perceptions, as well as the evaluations an individual makes of others when viewing others as leaders (p. 437).

In order to understand leadership perception, it is important to understand encoding and retrieval as two of the stages of information processing. In processing

information the stage of encoding involves the transforming and simplifying of information for transfer to long-term memory. An individual uses simplifying mechanisms to encode and add new information to the already existing long-term storage. This process creates knowledge structures such as prototypes, categories, and implicit information.

These knowledge structures are cognitive schemas that continue to permit an individual to interpret non-identical or new information from the environment, and allow an individual to implicitly recognize prototypes and organize information in the creation of perception of leaders. Cognitive researchers have hypothesized that a perceiver has had exposure to underlying leader traits and a pre-existing knowledge of the behaviors of leadership in a particular context. This information has been categorized into classifications that are simplified and stored in long-term memory (Lord & Maher, 1991). When a rater or perceiver is tasked to identify a leader, an eligible person may be classified based on the match of stimulus behaviors or traits associated with the implicit categories the rater or perceiver has created.

The retrieval stage allows for information recall from long-term memory, and with a cue consistent with original encoding, is retrievable and an individual is able to associate the information for decisions, actions, or judgments (Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 16). In order to continue to process short term and encode long-term memory storage and retrieval, individuals efficiently organize knowledge structures using a hierarchical categorization (Lord & Maher 1991, p. 17).

While knowledge structures are proposed as hierarchical in nature, the basic level of leadership categories consists of leader traits and behaviors which create prototypes, as

well as stimulus producing events or situations which are called scripts (Lord and Maher, 1991, p. 18). In leadership situations, categorization is matched to abstract prototypes and scripts perceived as leader characteristics by others. The leadership schema is activated if the perceiver's perceptions of past experiences that have been categorized as symbols provide a system for meaningful interpretation for the perceiver.

In 1985, Robert Lord developed the social processing model for leader perceptions which can be explained by the processes of recognition or inferential models which occur in either an automatic or controlled mode (Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 34). The categorization theory used in the process of matching and rating leadership perceptions can occur automatically from the memory of experiences. A recognition-based processing occurs when an individual makes the connections for the leaders traits or characteristics and matches perceptions with a leader prototype held in long-term memory (Ensari & Murphy, 2003, p.53).

Prototype matching perceptions can also be derived from controlled information processing without direct observation. This may occur through social communication such as a spoken communication on a leader's traits or abilities. Prototype matching can also be perceived from inference-based processing, which is inferring positive outcomes and events associated with the leadership process, leader, or organizational outcomes. Lord and Maher (1991) relate that when there is a good fit between leader characteristics and a prototype of attributes for leaders, an effective categorization occurs which affect perceptions of leaders and leader behavior.

Testing the theory of categorization, Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) completed a study with college students using an open-ended methodology to elicit "typical"

characteristics that describe leaders. The findings of Lord, et al. (1984) supported that leadership is a cognitive category arranged in a hierarchy in which widely shared attributes at the basic level category defined the super-ordinate leadership prototype. These findings are relevant for two reasons. First, at the time an individual is recognized as a leader, perceivers can rely on “existing category structures to describe a leader’s behaviors or form expectations about future behavior” (Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 43). Second, “...a simple act of categorization may provide a powerful cognitive structure that shapes the nature of interactions among people” (p. 43). In addition, Lord and Maher (1991) emphasize that knowledge structures guide information processing and behaviors, useful to individuals in social situations where schema are not static, in interactions important to a leader to impact subordinates, and for leaders within organizations to effectively maintain or change the culture.

An early criticism of the categorization model was that prototype matching to leadership ratings were controlled stimulus in an experimental setting and there were questions about the applicability in a non-controlled context. Subsequent non-experimental studies using category- based processing, including one study on perceptions of presidential candidates, provided data that leadership ratings and a prototypical perception were strongly associated. These findings supported earlier research that leadership constructs guided perceivers in processing information regarding leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 42).

Lord and Emrich (2001) emphasize that the creation of leader schemas is important; however, future researchers should examine the dynamic process of how cognitive schemas are redefined and new information is assimilated within a contextual

setting. Further research on individual cognition for perception of self as a leader may be valuable in self-regulation and self-efficacy (Lord & Emrich, 2001, p. 572). Lord and Emrich (2001) have recommended that the focus of leader research should include perceptions of leader traits and behaviors with links for measures of self-performance as contributors to “leader sensemaking” (p. 565), and in developing “appropriate behavioral scripts or motivational schema” (p. 555).

Ratings of Leadership Traits

The ratings of leadership traits survey is based on research testing a theoretical model for categorization of recognition-based leadership perception. For the purpose of this proposed research, leadership traits will be rated on a survey developed by Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) which furthered the research theory of categorization of Rosch (1978) identifying similar and dissimilar objects to abstractions or prototypes (Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 18). Once categorized these prototypes and their related information are encoded and later retrieved. At the highest hierarchical or super-ordinate level, these prototypes would support perceptions distinguishing leaders from non-leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 18). In applying research on the categorization theory, the widely shared prototype attributes that were at the lowest or basic level categories would define the highest leadership level. Based on this view, Rosch (1978) researched a theory called “family resemblance” in which widely shared critical attributes would define the super-ordinate level prototype (as cited in Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 45).

Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) proposed that leaders are distinguished from non-leaders based on an abstract prototype, and used the 11 different contexts of military, educational, business, religious, sports, world political, national political, financial,

minority, media, and labor, for specific types of leaders. Prototypicality [*sic*] is not defined by Lord and Maher (1991) however, it is noted that the researchers believe, “Moreover, use of a prototype model requires that abstract thinking become the *typical* [*sic*] rather than merely a *possible* [*sic*] mode of processing in forming perceptions” (p. 44). Undergraduate college students, considered novices to the contexts, reported their ratings on prototypicality [*sic*] and family resemblance for leader vs. non-leader categories, rating “fits my image of a leader”.

The two most frequently rated traits were dedicated and goal-oriented, respectively. In the third position, there was a tie for informed and charismatic, fourth position revealed a tie for decisive and responsible, fifth position: intelligent, determined, and organized were tied and in the sixth position, a tie was reported for verbal skills, believable, directing, and good administrator. An extensive analysis of the findings indicated (a) there are general implicit aspects of leadership that may result in overlapping; (b) there is similarity among the 11 contexts and familial resemblance; (c) intelligence was rated in ten of the 11 contexts and rated the highest in family resemblance at .91; and (d) some traits characterize leaders in only one context, therefore there is a situational contingency. Based on the 1984 findings, Lord et al. made three recommendations.

The first recommendation is that additional research needs to be completed to study if influences of gender, cross-cultural, or organizational positions are found. Second, if general leadership skills are learned skills through experiences relevant to the context, then leaders may need training in appropriate settings to make the necessary adjustments. Third, future leaders may be aided by perceived attributes such as

intelligence, but it is advisable that they work with mentors and serve in an apprenticeship experience within the leadership context (Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 54).

In this proposed research study, participants will respond to a modified “rating of leader traits”, created as a 35 trait list, and identify one categorization model of “prototypically” (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984, p. 343). The original laboratory research was designed to study perceptions of leader attribution, testing the three measures of leader family resemblance, cue validity, and leader prototypicality[sic] ratings, which were shown to be all strongly positively correlated (p. 357). Lord et al. (1984) defend the theory of cognitive researchers in stating leadership is a cognitive category that is organized in a hierarchy. Lord and Maher (1991) note, “Leaders are distinguished from non-leaders at the highest, super-ordinate level based on an abstract but general prototype” (p. 45).

Leadership Attributes

For this research, the employment of the two research surveys aims to identify the leader attributes of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” behaviors for self and perceptions of traits of others as leaders. The operational definition for this study states an attribute is what a leader possesses that is a characteristic, property, or quality that includes leadership traits, dispositions, influences, skills, character, and a practice capacity (Northouse, 2004; Stanford-Blair & Dickmann, 2005). Leaders need to possess attributes as personal characteristics and also need to practice multiple skills and competencies that foster leadership performance (Bass, 1985; Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Zaccaro, Kemp & Bader, 2003). In addition, Zaccaro, Kemp and Bader (2003)

propose leaders need stable capacities for cognitive and problem-solving skills, emotional and motivational skills; as well as the ability to reflect, appraise and adapt to a situation.

In preparing for the workforce, individuals preparing to serve as leaders need to accept continuous learning, develop an ability to change, desire to collaborate, and accept challenges; thereby, learning to lead which becomes “both a personal and organizational imperative” (Brown & Posner, 2001, p. 275). This leader development process is founded in critical reflection and self-awareness about one’s own values and beliefs. It develops into opportunities for trials and practice, in building trusting relationships, and interpreting this learning as a guide for actions (Brown & Posner, 2001). With increasing diversity, there needs to be research and support to assist students in defining a self-identity and responsibly choosing the terms for relationships with others.

Summary

This study examined if two generations of community college students enrolled at a large Midwest public community college reported that they engage in the exemplary leadership behaviors as identified by Kouzes and Posner (2002), and examined a student’s views of other leaders’ traits as identified by Lord, Foti, and De Vader (1984). Based upon the differences in preferred leadership styles of men and women as reported in current literature, and given the projected increase in the number of female community college alumna who will assume future leadership positions, as well as the projected diversity within the workforce, this study reports responses provided by men as compared to those provided by women in the sampled population; and if statistically, differences are reported based on generation and ethnicity.

A student's attribution of leader traits and self-perceptions may play significant roles in whether or not the student perceives self as a leader (Astin & Astin, 2000; Shertzer & Schuh, 2004; Vari, 2005). How one views individual and collective experience (Pilcher, 1994) will set the stage for the development of more comprehensive knowledge structures that will be created and redefined within a process of learning and practicing as a leader (Lord & Emrich, 2001). Leaders need to be able to accurately assess themselves and others as a guide in translating actual leadership skills and attributes into performance outcomes (Lord & Emrich, 2001; Prussia, Anderson, & Manz, 1998). This research study invited students of one community college to represent their cultural views and contribute data for possible application in preparing responsible leaders who view self as a change agent, have belief in self and fellow citizens, and have a voice.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this non-experimental study was to determine if two generations of community college student participants enrolled at a Midwest, public community college differed significantly in their self-report of engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” as identified by Kouzes and Posner (2002) based on their generation, gender, ethnicity. Additionally, the research examined a student’s views of other leaders’ traits, as identified by Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984), responding to “fits my image of a leader” and to determine if their responses differed significantly by generation, gender, ethnicity.

Research supports the importance of assessing students reports of engaging in an early identification of leader attributes in self and others (Hall & Lord, 1995; Lord & Maher, 1991; Welch, 2000), as well as recognizing modeling behaviors (Buford, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1987) as a foundation for becoming a leader and responsible citizen and (CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, 2003), in acknowledging differences (Arsenault, 2004; Paine, 2006). These processes are needed in the relational, collaborative leadership paradigm (Raelin, 2005; Rost, 1993; 1997) in which individuals need to consider self as a leader and a person of influence (Outcalt, Faris, McMahon, Tahtakran, & Noll, 2001).

A practice model for five exemplary leader practices as researched by Kouzes and Posner (1987, 2002), served as one framework in this study in which participants reflected and reported views of self for two of the exemplary leader behaviors. The first section of the research instrument is the Third Edition of The Leadership Practices

Inventory derived from the research of Kouzes and Posner (2003). The Leadership Practices Inventory instrument was selected for this study because it has been deemed an effective measure in the assessment and development of an individual as an exemplary leader (Kouzes & Posner, 1988, 1990, 2002, 2003, 2008; Posner, 2009).

The second theoretical framework guiding this study was based on the social-cognitive process of viewing others as leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991). Research has shown the identification of leader traits in role models from diverse cultural backgrounds may promote an individual in making meaning for self (Hall & Lord, 1995; Kezar, 2000; Lord & Emrich, 2001; Welch, 2000), and in establishing inter-dependent relationships (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The second section of the research instrument was the Ratings of Leadership Traits, chosen for this study because research has demonstrated it as an effective measure to identify perceptions of leader traits in others, and may contribute to perception of self as a leader, self-regulation, and self-efficacy, as well as script development for appropriate motivators and behaviors (Lord, Foti, and DeVader, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1991; Lord & Emrich, 2001).

This chapter will describe the methodology used for this study including the research questions, study variables, population and participant sample, research design, statistical assumptions, instrumentation, protection of human subjects, data collection procedure, data analysis, and limitations.

Research Questions

Based on the literature review, two research questions were posed for this study.

Question 1: Is there a statistically significant difference in the two generations of community college student participants' self-reports of engaging in the exemplary leader

behaviors for “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act”, based on generation, gender, ethnicity?

Question 2: Is there a statistically significant difference in the two generations of community college student participants’ reports on their “rating of leader traits” identified in others, responding to “fits my image of a leader”, based on generation, gender, ethnicity?

Study Variables

This investigation was based on “culture” of generation, gender, and ethnicity which is operationally defined as “an integrated pattern of human behavior that includes thoughts, communications, actions, customs, beliefs, values, and institutions of racial, ethnic, religious, or social nature” (Cuellar, Brennan, Vito, & deLeon Siantz, 2008, p. 144). Ethnicity refers to a social construct in which group members self-identify and share commonality with others (Cohen, 1978) through a heritage, language, ancestry, or traditions

The three independent variables were: (1) generation, (2) gender, and (3) ethnicity. The generations are defined as generation X members with birth years 1961-1981 who are currently ages 29-49; and millennial generation members with birth years 1982-1992 who are currently ages 18-28. Minor variations in these birth years and generation names have been noted in the literature however, this study applied the 20-year span and generational names designated by Howe & Strauss (2000). The demographic section of the survey was used to identify the three independent variables (see Appendix A) and, valid respondents were assigned to the generation using the age and birth year provided on the demographic survey. Gender was reported as male or

female. Ethnicity was reported using groupings: (1) American-Indian/Alaska Native; (2) Asian/Pacific Islander: identified as Chinese, Hawaiian, Indian, Korean, Filipino, Japanese, Pakistani; (3) Black/African-American; (4) Arab/Arab -American; (5) Hispanic/ Latino; (6) Caucasian/White; and (7) Other.

The three dependent variables were: (1) leader behaviors for “modeling the way”, (2) leader behaviors for “enabling others to act”, and (3) ratings of 35 leadership traits viewed in others responding to “fits my image of a leader”. The practice of “modeling the way” is represented by value clarification, finding a voice, advocating, setting an example that is aligned with values and beliefs, and choosing involvement (Kouzes & Posner, 2008). The practice of “enabling others to act” involves fostering collaboration and co-operation, building trust, strengthening others, and developing confidence and competence (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). For the third dependent variable, participants rated leader traits of others responding to “fits my image of a leader.”

Pilot Study. A pilot study was completed on one randomly selected course the semester prior to the research study. This pilot study served two purposes. First, it offered opportunity to identify time allocation, and questions or issues for the participants or teaching faculty. Second, it provided Cronbach’s alpha, found to be .80, to assess reliability of the modified tool for the 12 items for behaviors for “modeling the way” and “enabling others”. The 35 item list in the section identifying participants’ views of leader traits in others, rated a .91 Cronbach’s alpha. Those present in class and chose to participate were all females $N=17$, of whom eight were generation X and nine were millennial representatives, from six ethnicities. The full text was read and time was given for questions of which there were none. For future administration, the text was not

revised; however, three points were emphasized to the participants: (1) to use self as an informal or formal leader for frame of reference; (2) to rate “actual”, not ideal responses; (3) to rate a score of three or lower for the behaviors that did not apply or are not enacted frequently. Students stated both verbal and written instructions were clear and congruent.

Population and Participant Sample

The population for this study was United States community college students. The sample consisted of participants enrolled in a public, Midwestern suburban community college, from randomly selected courses from the course population that is most likely representative of members from both generations. The main campus of the community college has credit, certificate, and program course offerings for students representing 26 communities with a total population of nearly 400,000 persons of varied generational, socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds. According to institutional data available for the full academic year 2009-2010, there was an annual enrollment of over 42,000 credit and non-credit students. The Spring semester 2011 credit course enrollment was 18,628 students of whom 6,734 (36.1%) were enrolled full time; and 11, 894 (63.9%) were enrolled part time.

Participating Community College Data

Enrollment by Generation

The Spring semester 2011 demographic data from the community college indicated 31.25% of the students were age 25 and older, while 68.25% were represented by age 25 and under. Table 1 provides the age group percentages for the community college student population (Institutional Research & Planning Department, 2011) calculated as they align with this study. In reviewing this data, it is important to note

there was one study issues for this age demographic supplied by the institution. Some of the enrollees 18 years of age or younger may be enrolled in high school dual-enrollment classes, on or off main campus, and may represent students not eligible for this study.

Table 1
Ages of Enrolled Students for 2011 Spring Semester

Ages of Enrolled Students	Percent
Age under 18; 50 or older	16.86%
Age 18 - 28	65.10%
Age 29 – 49	18.04%

To ensure students are age 18 and older, the following measures were taken during this research. First, each participant was assigned to the generation using the age and birth year provided on the demographic survey (see Appendix A). In order to be a valid respondent, students must be 18 to 49 years of age and must be enrolled in a random selected course section on the main campus. Completed surveys in which participants indicated ages under 18 or over 49 were discarded as described in the data analysis procedure.

Enrollment by Gender

As noted in Table 2, there were 4% more females than males enrolled during the Spring 2011 semester. This may result in a less accurate representation of participants by gender; therefore, a careful sampling of course sections at varied times was taken.

Table 2
Gender of 18,628 Students Enrolled for 2011 Spring Semester

	Number of Students	Percentage
Gender		
Male	8,948	48%
Female	9,680	52%

Enrollment by Ethnicity

The 2011Spring semester community college enrollment breakdown by ethnicity, as reported, is shown in Table 3 (Institutional Research & Planning Department, 2011). It is important to note there were four study issues for this demographic. First, these statistics do not allow for a further breakdown of ethnicities within the 413 (2.5%) students reporting as Asian. Second, there is no designation for Arab/Arab-American, and third, there is no indication of the ethnicities of the 257 (1.6%) students studying on a Visa. Fourth, and finally, while this reporting offered students a choice for a newly instituted category for more than one race, there was no opportunity for students to indicate “other” in the institutional data collected.

Table 3

Reported Ethnicity of 18,628 Students Enrolled for 2011 Spring Semester

Ethnicity	Number of Students	Percentage
Caucasian/White	11,586	71.4%
Hispanic	2,047	12.6%
Black/African-American	1,769	10.9%
Asian/ Hawaiian	413	2.5%
Studying on a visa	257	1.6%
American Indian	80	0.5%
More than one race	50	0.3%

To address these issues, the research demographic survey provided a means for the participants to identify the categories not reported on the participating community college survey. This research survey provided for choices for reporting: a specific ethnicity within Asian and Hawaiian, Arab ethnicity, the ethnicity of students who are currently studying on Visa, and offered the option for stating “other”. The category of “other” gives participants the opportunity to identify an ethnic category not listed. This community college has a distinct presence of Greek, Polish, and Romanian immigrant enrollees. If 30 or more participants from the sample identify an “other” ethnicity that represents their native country, that ethnic category will be examined and reported in the research results section.

Participant Selection Procedure

A table of recommended sample sizes for the population of this study ($N=18,000$) identifies an appropriate sample size of $n=376$ participants (Orcher, 2005, p. 240). The sample size for seven ethnicities will need a minimum of 30 participants in each level. If this level for participation is not achieved, ethnicities will be regrouped based on the responses. A sampling of $n=376$ allowed for diversity of overall enrollments for generation, gender, and ethnicity of the community college population to achieve the desired power needed for statistical analyses.

The research director at the institution assisted in randomly selecting the course sections for the sample using a computerized database. The participating community college offers approximately 2,800-3,000 course sections each semester with an average class size of 23 students. In the Spring semester 2011, there were approximately 2,500 course sections available for a random selection of classes placed in the first half of the semester and offered on days, evenings, and weekends. There were approximately 150 classes excluded from the random selection, which had already been randomly selected to participate in the Community College Study of Student Engagement (CCSSE) study, to lessen the class time taken to complete research surveys.

In order for 376 students to participate, the first selection of random class sections numbered 29, which resulted in 22 current classes on the main campus. This sampling yielded opportunity for access: (1) to a representative diversity of students who attend day, evening, weekend, returning adult, and honors classes, (2) to day, evening, and weekend classes with a maximum class size of 32 and an average census of 23, and (3) to students after withdrawal deadlines and a non-scheduled midterm or final exam week.

Each of the faculty members teaching the randomly selected course sections was contacted from one to four weeks in advance, by campus e-mail seeking permission to distribute the research surveys to their students during class time. The invitation to participate: (1) indicated their class section(s) had been chosen to participate, (2) provided specific details of the research process for them including the time frame and expectations pertinent to the class time needed for the study (see Appendix B), and (3) the option to opt out of participating in the study.

The faculty members were asked to reply directly to the invitation within seven days to accept or decline participation. Several declined or accepted immediately, some required a second or third email follow up before an answer was given. In light of the fact that the selected courses had lower attendance than originally expected, and there were several declinations or non-responders, an additional ten class sections were randomly selected and the contact process replicated.

Research Design

A quantitative, non-experimental, research design was chosen for this research study. The participant sample was drawn from the Midwest community college population attendees from the randomly selected course sections. Responses to the two research questions were analyzed by performing a between groups factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to identify statistically significant differences between the three independent variables, generation, gender, and ethnicity. As indicated in the literature that differences exist, the research hypothesis was that the mean values will be statistically different for the sample groups on reports of “modeling the way”, “enabling

others to act”, and “rating of leader traits” identified in others responding to “fits my image of a leader”.

Research question one was analyzed using the student mean scores to answer the questions to identify interactions between the generations of community college participants in responses to the two dependent variables for “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” behaviors, respectively. The null hypothesis is that there will be no statistically significant differences in generation X and millennial generation group reports for engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” behaviors based on generation, gender, ethnicity.

The second research question was analyzed using the student mean scores to identify interactions between the generations of community college participants in response to “rating of leader traits” in others responding to “fits my image of a leader”. The null hypothesis was there will be no statistically significant differences in generation X and millennial generation group reports in response to “rating of leader traits” in others responding to “fits my image of a leader” based on generation, gender, ethnicity.

The MANOVA was chosen because it “emphasizes the mean differences and statistical significance of differences among groups” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 243). MANOVA was also chosen to determine if there is a main and interaction effect between the independent variables and if the interaction is significant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 247). It was chosen instead of one-way analysis (ANOVA) because it has an advantage over a series of ANOVA when attempting to identify a combination of dependent variables which may be more powerful. Choosing the MANOVA rather than the series of ANOVA also protects against inflated Type I error, where a statistically significant

difference between the groups is found when significance does not exist (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Statistical Assumptions

In light of the fact the two research questions were analyzed using the MANOVA statistical method, the following key assumptions were tested: (1) the dependent variable will need to be normally distributed for each population as assessed by skewness, (2) the variances and co-variances among the dependent variables were the same across all variables, as tested by Box's Test of Equality, and (3) there was be a random sample of independent cases (Green & Salkind, 2005, p. 220) as described in chapter 4. These assumptions were met for the MANOVA in answering the first research question. The second research question had violations to the normal distribution of each population as will be addressed in chapter 5.

Instrumentation

The research survey, Appendix A, was divided into three sections.

Demographic survey. The first section of the research survey elicited responses: (a) distinguishing age and birth year; and recognizing those respondents not eligible by age and birth year, (b) identifying gender, and (c) distinguishing participants' ethnic background.

Leadership Practice Inventory survey. The second section of the survey consists of the 12 questions from the Third Edition of the Leadership Practice Inventory for which permission had been granted (Kouzes and Posner, 3rd ed., 2003). A signed adherence was agreed upon and returned to the authors; subsequently the survey tool expressed written permission information (see Appendix D). Researchers Posner and Kouzes (1988)

proposed a conceptual framework to understand leadership and created a valid instrument that would serve as a reliable measure for assessing leader practices. In the development of the original leadership inventory, a personal best survey was employed to elicit leader experiences, actions, and strategies from 1,100 respondents. Additionally, qualitative measures were conducted in 38 interviews and case studies. According to Posner and Kouzes, “More than 80% of behavior and strategies described in respondents’ personal best case studies and interviews can be accounted for by these factors” (Posner & Kouzes, 1988, p. 485).

The Leadership Practice Inventory was developed after several iterations to provide a shorter qualitative tool that would represent the leader behaviors. It has been utilized with larger samples to improve generalizability of the instrument. Since its inception in 1985 nearly one quarter of a million people have responded to the instrument and it has been utilized in 250 doctoral dissertations. In a recent three-year period, 1.1 million people responded to the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI). In light of the data analysis of the psychometric properties, Posner concluded “The LPI continues to be a reliable and valid instrument” (Posner, 2009). For self-reports, the “modeling the way” behaviors showed an internal reliability coefficient measured by Cronbach’s Alpha as .74 for N= 101, 403 respondents; and similarly, a Cronbach’s Alpha of .73 for “enabling others to act” behaviors for the same sample (Posner, 2009, p. 5). Additional information on the age, gender and ethnicity reports of the landmark study is provided in chapter 2.

For this research the Third Edition of the Leadership Practice Inventory was used. Kouzes and Posner (2003) made two revisions to the second edition Leadership Practice Inventory. While maintaining the 30 items that represent the five exemplary leadership

behaviors, the researchers first revised and edited several leadership behavior statements in seeking continuity with edits to the practice of the five exemplary leader behaviors. Second, the researchers made a revision in the Likert scale from a numerical rating of five to a ten-point scale. In eliciting data for this study, the 12 questions relevant to the two dependent variables of leader behaviors for self were administered and analyzed.

Kouzes and Posner (2003) state that the reliability is enhanced when a behavior is asked about more than once: therefore, the researchers provided six items that relate to each behavior. To ensure the leader behaviors are represented in the same order of the Leadership Practice Inventory instrument, the research questions for this study was numbered one to twelve following the original order of appearance on the Third Edition of the instrument. This modification maintains internal reliability by alternating the six questions for the behaviors for “modeling the way” with the six questions for behaviors of “enabling others to act” (Kouzes & Posner, 2001, B1) (see Table 4). The mean scores for the self-rated six behaviors for “modeling the way” and the self-rated six behaviors for “enabling others to act” are reported in chapter 4.

Table 4

The Questions Representing the Exemplary Leader Behaviors

Source	Exemplary Leader Behaviors
Leadership Practices Inventory	
“Modeling the Way”	<p>1. I set a personal example of what I expect of others.</p> <p>3. I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.</p> <p>5. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.</p> <p>7. I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance.</p> <p>9. I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.</p> <p>11. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.</p>
“Enabling Others to Act”	<p>2. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.</p> <p>4. I actively listen to diverse points of view.</p> <p>6. I treat others with dignity and respect.</p> <p>8. I support the decisions that people make on their own.</p> <p>10. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.</p> <p>12. I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.</p>

Ratings of Leadership Traits survey. The Ratings of Leadership Traits survey is based on research which identified the perception and report of leadership traits as ideally fitting the image of a leader. Lord and colleagues developed the theory for recognition-based and expert information processing as knowledge structures in leadership perception. The research of Lord and colleagues furthered the research theory of Rosch, who theorized a view called “family resemblance” in which widely shared critical attributes would define the super-ordinate prototype (Lord & Maher, 1991, p. 45). Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) proposed that leaders are distinguished from non-leaders based on an abstract prototype and used the 11 different contexts of military, educational, business, religious, sports, world political, national political, financial, minority, media, and labor, for specific types of leaders.

Undergraduate college students, considered novices to the contexts, reported their ratings on prototypicality [*sic*] and family resemblance for leader vs. non-leader categories, rating “fits my image of a leader”. In the original research, the two most frequently rated traits were dedicated and goal-oriented, respectively. In the third position, there was a tie for informed and charismatic, and the fourth position revealed a tie for decisive and responsible. In the fifth position: intelligent, determined, and organized were tied and in the sixth position, a tie was reported for verbal skills, believable, directing, and good administrator.

In identifying leader traits in others, this research study required participants to rate the 35 leader traits of others from a list, following consistent spoken and written instructions as found in Appendix A. Permission had been granted to use the prototypical ratings as a research tool; subsequently the survey section expresses written permission

information (see Appendix D). The responses for the 35 traits were analyzed finding no significant differences between and within the generation, gender, cultural groups in the process of viewing leader traits. Research results are detailed in chapter 4.

Protection of Human Subjects

This study proposal was submitted for review and approved by the Old Dominion University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects and the Midwest Community College Institutional Research and Planning Committee Human Subjects Review Board. The participating institutional guidelines for minimal risk, appropriate interaction, legal age, private information, and intervention free research were followed. The community college review board, as well as the faculty members who participated with their class sections approved the use of class time. According to the community college research guidelines, an individual 18 years and older gives implied consent by completing and returning the questionnaire. In order to assure informed consent, the participants were informed of the purpose, procedure, disposition and access to data, and the participant's rights.

In compliance with a community college guideline for parental/guardian permission for subjects under age 18, students who are under the age of 18 were instructed to refrain from participating in this research. In the event an underage student mistakenly completed the research survey, the survey was discarded and destroyed as described in the data analysis procedure. In verbal and written instructions, participants were informed of their rights and privacy by advisement that participation is strictly voluntary and may be terminated at any time without consequences to them. As written in Appendix C, guidelines informing participants that no individual identifiers or

identification will be obtained, extracted, or documented were spoken in each class section.

Data Collection Procedure

At the specified time, for the respective course sections, the requisite numbers of research surveys were distributed for participants to complete during class time. In the event students had previously completed the research survey in a different class section, they were instructed to exclude themselves from completing a second survey. To lessen threats to external validity, there was a reading of a standard written text with uniform, consistent instructions. Specific instructions were also written on each survey. The oversight and collection of the research surveys was completed in an unobtrusive and unhurried manner. As a token of appreciation, students completing the survey could select to participate in a bookstore gift card drawing in which four participant winners were notified by student campus e-mail. The gift card winners were directed to the Institutional Research office to receive their gift. All entries were shredded and discarded using the campus procedure.

With permission, in one selected class, a teaching faculty member who is a doctoral candidate in the Old Dominion University Community College Leadership program was used as a surrogate for distribution of 13 research surveys. Detailed instructions regarding distribution and a copy of the verbal instructions to be read to participants were provided for the surrogate. During class time, the surrogate verbally emphasized the written text, including that participation in this study was voluntary, there would be no student identifiers extracted, and responding had no bearing on course grades. After following guidelines for administration, the surrogate had the participants

place the completed surveys into an envelope which was then sealed and locked in an office file cabinet. The surrogate professor never saw the completed surveys which were folded with the unmarked side outward and were opened during data editing by the solo researcher.

Data Analysis

During the data screening process, the research surveys were checked for consistency with age and birth year. Several surveys did not include a birth year however, the participants each checked their age group and that was the determinant to select generational membership. The surveys of respondents who were not representatives of the generation X or millennial generation, and were ineligible to participate, were pulled, shredded, and immediately disposed in a central campus location. At this point in time, data was screened for birthdates, especially the birth year that placed a respondent in a marginal position for either entering or exiting a generational cohort group. No individuals were found to be marginal in placement for generation. In the data screening process, the data was numbered, entered employing nominal labels, and checked for accuracy.

The reliability of the scales were examined with a Cronbach's alpha found to be .74 for "modeling the way" behaviors; and a Cronbach's alpha of .72 for "enabling others to act" behaviors. The 35 item list in the section identifying participants' views of leader traits in others rated a .91 Cronbach's alpha. Utilizing the SPSS program for all analyses, descriptive statistics were completed for each of the independent and dependent variables as detailed in chapter 4. The assumptions for the MANOVA were tested. A MANOVA

was completed and analyzed to answer the research questions. Based on the MANOVA results, subsequent analysis was not indicated.

Limitations

The research results may not be generalizable to other community colleges of diverse populations. One effort to lessen this limitation included a plan and report for a culturally diverse sampling in this study. Throughout the survey distribution process it was noted that participants were representative of the campus population.

Another limitation noted was with the use of computer generated, randomly selected course sections, as there is no distinction of the student subpopulations. To lessen this limitation, measures were taken to pursue varied diverse class offerings supplied in the random course selections.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this non-experimental study was to determine if there is a statistically significant difference in the self-report of Midwestern United States, public community college student participants on engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” based on generation, gender, ethnicity. Additionally, the research examined if statistically significant differences were found in the same community college participants’ reports in the rating of leader traits of others responding to “fits my image of a leader”, and to determine if the responses differ by generation, gender, ethnicity. This chapter presents the results of this study.

Profile of Student Participants

As recommended for a population of 18,000 a sample size of 376 enrolled students was sought to complete this study (Orcher, 2005). In order to acquire a sample of 376 culturally diverse community college student participants and with a projection of an average class attendance of 23 students, the assisting campus research director accessed the eligible day, weekend, and evening campus course offerings and randomly selected 30 class sections. One offering was an identical repeat of a class section. This provided an initial computer generated random selection for 29 class sections of community college students enrolled in the 2011 Spring semester.

During the same semester, but not part of this study, randomly selected classes on campus were completing the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The campus research director believed that in the best interest of stakeholders, class time within the same class sections would not be used in multiple research projects.

Therefore, the 29 teaching faculty members of the chosen class sections for this study were assured in the original contact e-mail that their selected section would not be participating in the student engagement research.

After the initial e-mail contact to the teaching faculty in the selected course sections, ten sections were found to be ineligible or unavailable for data collection due to multiple factors. These factors included faculty members not responding to, or declining the invitation; course exams and projects; class cancellations due to inclement weather; and, scheduled faculty development meetings. An additional follow-up contact was made to the non-respondents; however, this did not result in additional participation. After the first selection, an initial arrangement and distribution of research surveys was made to 19 class sections.

In the early stage of the distribution of the study, it was determined that the class sizes were smaller than the projected 23 students, prompting a random selection of ten additional class sections and a three week extension in the timeframe for acquiring data. This extension allowed for courses meeting in the second half of the 16 week semester and an opportunity to include hybrid courses which meet less frequently on campus. With the second selection for ten random course sections, one high school campus, dual enrollment program, was ineligible, leaving nine eligible course sections. The contact process for these added sections was the same as for the initial sample.

Of the second random selections, seven faculty members accepted the invitation, making 26 the final number of class sections in which data was collected. Of the 26 course sections, 15 (58%) were day classes and 11 (42%) were evening classes. No weekend or Wednesday only selections were made; and courses were offered in both

halves of the 16 week semester. A total of 405 surveys were distributed and 402 were collected.

Of the 402 surveys, ten were pulled and destroyed immediately because individuals were under or over the age limit for participation. Sixteen surveys were unusable due to incomplete data which included lack of birth year or gender; or unanswered sections of the survey. The 26 (15.4%) unusable surveys were destroyed using the campus procedure as outlined in chapter 3. Basic demographic data were collected and were used to provide a description of the 376 eligible participants.

Generational Composition

The community college campus population for the Spring 2011 semester was a total enrollment of 18, 628 enrollees, of whom 18% were within the generation X group, and 65% within the millennial age group. More than 16% of the students enrolled in community college courses during the 2011 Spring semester were not eligible for this study because they were age 17 or younger; or 50 years and older. The composition of the final research sample is shown in Table 5, indicating that the number of participating generation X students is consistent with the general student population. Eighty-five per cent of the sample respondents were from the millennial generation, compared to 66% who were millennial age cohorts in the college population.

Table 5

Generational Representation of Study Participants

	Total Responses	Percentage
Generation X (Age 29-49)	56	14.9%
Millennial Generation (Age 18-28)	320	85.1%

Gender Demographic

The community college Spring 2011 enrollment census reflects a 4% higher female than male population. As noted in Table 6, for this study, more males than females were participants.

Table 6

Gender Percentages of Student Participants

	Total Responses	Percentage
Gender		
Male	198	52.7%
Female	178	47.3%

The overall percentages by generation and gender, as noted in Table 7, show the 198 male participants consisted of 21 generation X; and 177 millennial generation members. The 178 female participants consisted of 35, and 143, participants from generation X and the millennial generation, respectively.

Table 7

Representation by Generation and Gender

		Total Responses	Percentage
Generation			
X	Male	21	5.59%
	Female	35	9.30%
Millennial	Male	177	47.07%
	Female	143	38.03%

Racial and Ethnic Identity

The research instrument allowed for seven categories for ethnicity. In compiling the data, it was noted: (a) there were three male and no female representatives of American Indian/ Alaskan Native ethnicity, (b) there were 21 representatives of Asian/Pacific Islander ethnicity, with no male generation X and 20 millennial generation members, and (c) the ethnicity chosen as “other” was identified by 26 (6.9%) of the respondents, with 20 reporting more than one ethnicity and six reporting an ethnicity not listed. Table 8 identifies the participants by ethnicity.

Table 8

Racial and Ethnic Identity

	Total Responses	Percentage
Racial and Ethnic		
1. American Indian/ Alaska Native	3	.08%
2. Asian/ Pacific Islander	21	5.6%
3. Black/ African-American	27	7.2%
4. Arab/ Arab-American	38	10.1%
5. Hispanic/ Latino	58	15.4%
6. Caucasian/ White	203	53.9%
7. Other	26	6.9%

Because of the unbalanced ethnicity and fewer than eight respondents of each generation and gender in some groups, the ethnicity groups were collapsed into a new category of non-Caucasian. As shown in Table 9, this newly created category consisted of: 30 Generation X and 143 millennial students; 85 male and 88 female participants. The ethnicity reported as Caucasian or white consisted of: 26 Generation X and 177 millennial students; 113 male and 90 female participants.

Table 9

Participant Representation by Ethnicity, Generation, Gender

		Total Responses	Percentage
Caucasian			
		203	54.0%
Generation X		26	6.9%
	Male	12	3.2%
	Female	14	3.8%
Millennial		177	47.0%
	Male	101	26.8%
	Female	76	20.2%
non-Caucasian			
		173	46.0%
Generation X		30	7.9%
	Male	9	2.3%
	Female	21	5.6%
Millennial		143	38.0%
	Male	76	20.2%
	Female	67	17.8%

Analysis of Research Question One

The first research question addressed the self-reporting of the community college participants' for engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors for "modeling the way" and "enabling others to act". The research instrument elicited an individual response for each of the six statements that represent the exemplary leader behaviors for "modeling the way": (1) I set a personal example of what I expect of others, (2) I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on, (3) I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make, (4) I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance, (5) I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization, (6) I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.

Additionally, it elicited the responses for the six statements that represent the exemplary leader behaviors for "enabling others to act": (1) I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with, (2) I actively listen to diverse points of view, (3) I treat others with dignity and respect, (4) I support the decisions that people make on their own, (5) I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work, (6) I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.

Prior to conducting the MANOVA analysis, the mean scores and standard deviation were completed on the 12 original survey items representing the self-reported leader behaviors. An initial statistical analysis was calculated for each of the 376 participants using the survey ratings from 1 (Almost never) to 10 (Almost always) responding to the individual statements representing the modeling and enabling

behaviors. The data in Table 10 lists the 12 behaviors, in descending rank order by highest means, and shows generation, gender, and ethnicity means for comparison.

A data analysis revealed “I treat others with dignity and respect”, was the behavior that ranked first of all the 12 leader behaviors with a mean score of 9.21 ($SD=1.20$). The behavior, “I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make” with a mean score of 8.70 ($SD=1.35$) ranked first of the “modeling the way”, behaviors and second of all the 12 exemplary leader behaviors. These two behaviors were rated four or higher by all of the 376 respondents, indicating the behavior described is practiced at least “once in a while” or with more frequency. The behavior for “adhering to principles” received an exact mean score of $M=7.36$ from both generation X and millennial generation levels.

The two behaviors that were rated the lowest of all the 12 behaviors by the 376 participants were: building a consensus ($M=7.17$, $SD=1.83$); and asking feedback on how ones’ actions affect others ($M=6.98$, $SD=2.07$) both representing “modeling the way” behaviors. With the exception of two modeling behaviors of “following through on promises and commitments made” ($M=8.70$) and “I am clear about my philosophy of leadership” ($M=8.17$), all the six “enabling others to act” behaviors were rated higher than the four “modeling the way” behaviors.

Table 10

Descending Order of Self-Rated “Modeling the Way” (MO) and “Enabling Others to Act” (E) Leader Behaviors Practiced by 376 Community College Participants

Exemplary Behaviors	Mean and Standard		Generation		Gender		Ethnicity	
	Deviation		X	Millennial	Male	Female	Caucasian	non-Caucasian
	Mean	S.D.						
	N=376		n=56	n=320	n=198	n=178	n=203	n=173
Treat others with dignity and respect <i>E</i>	9.21	1.20	9.16	9.22	9.04	9.39	9.20	9.22
Follow through on commitments and promises <i>MO</i>	8.70	1.35	8.75	8.69	8.48	8.95	8.61	8.81
Develop relationships <i>E</i>	8.56	1.47	8.73	8.52	8.98 .52	8.59	8.61	8.49
Ensure growth <i>E</i>	8.49	1.69	8.91	8.41	8.36	8.62	8.41	8.56
Listen to diverse views <i>E</i>	8.31	1.54	8.34	8.31	8.14	8.51	8.26	8.36
Clear philosophy <i>MO</i>	8.17	1.72	8.45	8.13	8.21	8.10	8.08	8.25
Give others freedom of choice <i>E</i>	7.96	1.78	7.95	7.96	7.88	8.05	7.93	7.99
Support decisions <i>E</i>	7.94	1.62	8.13	7.91	7.66	8.25	7.87	8.01

Table 10 (continued).

Descending Order of Self-Rated “Modeling the Way”(MO) and “Enabling Others to Act” (E) Leader Behaviors Practiced by 376 Community College Participants

Exemplary Behaviors	Mean and Standard		Generation		Gender		Ethnicity	
	Deviation		X	Millennial	Male	Female	Caucasian	non-Caucasian
	Mean	S.D.						
	N=376		n=56	n=320	n=198	n=178	n=203	n=173
Set personal example <i>MO</i>	7.40	1.87	8.07	7.28	7.28	7.53	7.30	7.50
Adhere to principles <i>MO</i>	7.36	1.81	7.36	7.36	7.40	7.29	7.40	7.29
Build a consensus <i>MO</i>	7.17	1.83	7.84	7.05	7.02	7.34	7.10	7.24
Ask feedback <i>MO</i>	6.98	2.07	7.39	6.91	6.88	7.10	6.84	7.14

Note. On a ten point scale.

In order to conduct the MANOVA, scale scores were created for a modeling scale and an enabling scale. Each scale, comprising a new dependent variable, was created by summing the six items representing each of the exemplary leader behaviors and dividing by six, allowing for the mean score to be calculated for each of the 376 individual cases. The data was screened with no missing data noted. Descriptive statistics were calculated on the scaled variables to compare mean scores and no out of range cases were noted.

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to compare the group differences and interrelationships across the dependent variables. The final dependent variables used for the MANOVA were: (1) “modeling behaviors” scale, and (2) “enabling behaviors” scale. The three independent variables, each with two categories: (1) generation, X or millennial; (2) gender, male or female; (3) ethnicity, Caucasian or non-Caucasian. An analysis of the estimated marginal mean scores of one variable alone resulting in a main effect and an interaction effect based on the combination of group variables were examined; finding the enabling scores were rated higher than the model scale behavior scores by both generation, gender, and ethnicity categories (see Table 11).

Table 11

Estimated Marginal Means by Generation, Gender, Ethnicity for the Dependent Variable Scales for “Modeling the Way” and “Enabling Others to Act”

Model Scale	<i>N</i>	Marginal Mean	Standard Deviation
Generation X	56	7.88	.168
Millennial Generation	320	7.55	.068
Male	198	7.60	.140
Female	178	7.83	.115
Caucasian	203	7.70	.126
non-Caucasian	173	7.74	.130
<hr/>			
Enable Scale	<i>N</i>	Marginal Mean	Standard Deviation
Generation X	56	8.48	.143
Millennial Generation	320	8.38	.058
Male	198	8.31	.119
Female	178	8.55	.098
Caucasian	203	8.36	.108
non-Caucasian	173	8.51	.110

Note. On a ten point scale.

The assumptions were examined prior to completing the MANOVA analysis. Linearity was assessed by examining scatter plots between each pair of variables, with none found to be non-linear; therefore, the assumption of linearity was satisfied. Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was not significant, $F(21, 15270) = .037$,

$p > .001$, indicating the assumption of homogeneity of co-variances was not violated.

Levene's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was found to be $p = .051$, $p > .050$, for the scale for "modeling the way". The Levene's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was found to be $p = .219$, $p > .050$, for the scale "enabling others". These values indicate the assumption of equality of variance was not violated at the conventional alpha level.

Multivariate testing was completed to find if statistically significant differences exist among the groups on a linear combination of the dependent variables. The significance level used for the MANOVA was adjusted using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .025, allowing for the two dependent variables. The Wilks' Lambda was used to evaluate group differences. In reviewing the results of generation, gender, and ethnicity on the dependent scales for "modeling the way" and "enabling others to act", there was no statistically significant difference: $F(2, 367) = .640$, $p > .025$; Wilks' Lambda = .997 (see Table 12).

Table 12

<i>Multivariate Analysis of Variance for Generation, Gender, Ethnicity</i>				
Source	<i>Df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	η^2
Generation	2	2.00	.137	.011
Gender	2	1.22	.294	.007
Ethnicity	2	.581	.560	.003
Generation*Gender	2	1.44	.237	.008
Generation*Ethnicity	2	1.94	.145	.010
Gender*Ethnicity	2	1.11	.330	.006
Generation*Gender*Ethnicity	2	.640	.528	.003

No statistically significant differences were found between generation X and the millennial generation group participants, $F(2, 367) = 2.00, p > .025$, Wilks' Lambda .989; between male and female group participants, $F(2, 367) = 1.22, p > .025$, Wilks' Lambda .993; Caucasian and non-Caucasian ethnicity groups, $F(2, 367) = .581, p > .025$, Wilks' Lambda .997; indicating no main effects.

Also analyzed were the independent variable combinations of generation and gender, $F(2, 367) = 1.44, p > .025$, Wilks' Lambda .992; generation and ethnicity, $F(2, 367) = 1.94, p > .025$, Wilks' Lambda .990; and gender and ethnicity, $F(2, 367) = 1.11, p > .025$, Wilks' Lambda .994; with no statistically significant differences found for the “modeling the way” or “enabling others to act” scales. The results indicated that the responses of the community college students did not differ significantly based on generation, gender, ethnicity, or any combination of the three. There were no follow-up analyses conducted as a result of finding no significant differences between the groups and combinations of groups including generation, gender, and ethnicity.

Analysis of Research Question Two

The second research question addressed if there was a significant difference in community college student participants' responding to “fits my image of a leader” by rating leader traits identified in others. The research instrument, a modified version of the hierarchical order resulting from the original research by Lord, Foti, and DeVader, 1984, allowed participants to respond by rating 1 (not at all well) to 5 (extremely well).

Prior to conducting the analysis, descriptive statistics were run to test the assumptions of a MANOVA. The assessment of the Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances revealed 11 of the 35 traits violated the assumption of equality of variances.

These were: dedicated, responsible, honest, trustworthy, fair, cooperative, loyal, caring, humanitarian, likeable, and healthy. Of these traits, seven rank in the ten highest rated traits as noted by mean scores of the 376 participants. The distribution of participants in the cells, particularly fewer respondents of generation X ($n=56$) than millennial ($n=320$) respondents may have contributed to this finding.

Table 13

Estimated Marginal Means on Leader Traits in Others Rating "Fits My Image of a Leader"

Source	Mean and Standard		Generation		Gender		Ethnicity	
Leader Traits	Deviation							
	Mean	S.D.	X	Millennial	Male	Female	Caucasian	non-Caucasian
	(N=376)		(n=56)	(n=320)	(n=198)	(n=178)	(n=203)	(n=173)
Trustworthy	4.77	.496	4.70	4.78	4.63	4.85	4.67	4.81
Loyal	4.68	.631	4.58	4.70	4.50	4.77	4.64	4.64
Responsible	4.65	.601	4.69	4.63	4.56	4.76	4.74	4.59
Honest	4.63	.690	4.72	4.62	4.56	4.78	4.60	4.74
Fair	4.54	.711	4.43	4.56	4.28	4.71	4.48	4.51
Understanding	4.54	.677	4.48	4.56	4.47	4.56	4.44	4.60
Cooperative	4.53	.669	4.48	4.56	4.46	4.58	4.41	4.63
Open-minded	4.51	.752	4.33	4.53	4.41	4.44	4.32	4.54
Dedicated	4.50	.693	4.62	4.48	4.57	4.54	4.51	4.60
Determined	4.47	.726	4.39	4.48	4.38	4.49	4.46	4.40

Table 13 (continued). Estimated Marginal Means on Leader Traits in Others Rating "Fits My Image of a Leader"

Source	Mean and Standard		Generation		Gender		Ethnicity	
Leader Traits	Deviation							
	Mean	S.D.	X	Millennial	Male	Female	Caucasian	non-Caucasian
	(N=376)		(n=56)	(n=320)	(n=198)	(n=178)	(n=203)	(n=173)
Caring	4.46	.789	4.28	4.49	4.16	4.61	4.35	4.42
Strong character	4.46	.754	4.49	4.44	4.49	4.44	4.47	4.46
Likeable	4.43	.797	4.17	4.47	4.11	4.52	4.33	4.30
Believable	4.40	.731	4.41	4.39	4.34	4.45	4.37	4.43
Goal-oriented	4.39	.775	4.49	4.37	4.42	4.45	4.41	4.45
Educated	4.36	.742	4.16	4.39	4.19	4.36	4.25	4.29
Interested	4.36	.777	4.13	4.39	4.06	4.46	4.30	4.22
Disciplined	4.32	.835	4.49	4.29	4.40	4.39	4.35	4.44
Concerned	4.30	.841	4.50	4.27	4.23	4.54	4.36	4.40
Intelligent	4.25	.839	4.10	4.27	4.06	4.31	4.08	4.29
Informed	4.22	.778	4.41	4.18	4.23	4.36	4.26	4.32

Table 13 (continued). *Estimated Marginal Means on Leader Traits in Others Rating “Fits My Image of a Leader”*

Source	Mean and Standard		Generation		Gender		Ethnicity	
Leader Traits	Deviation							
	Mean	S.D.	X	Millennial	Male	Female	Caucasian	non-Caucasian
	(N=376)		(n=56)	(n=320)	(n=198)	(n=178)	(n=203)	(n=173)
Persistent	4.21	.791	4.36	4.19	4.24	4.30	4.24	4.31
Healthy	4.21	.949	4.09	4.24	4.17	4.15	3.98	4.39
Well groomed	4.17	1.05	4.00	4.20	3.94	4.26	4.11	4.10
Competitive	4.17	.979	4.00	4.16	4.04	4.11	4.20	3.95
Insightful	4.15	.825	4.10	4.14	3.92	4.32	4.23	4.01
Persuasive	4.06	.890	3.81	4.08	3.88	4.00	3.94	3.95
Verbal skills	4.05	.895	4.11	4.03	3.96	4.18	4.05	4.09
Good administrator	4.03	.887	4.19	3.99	4.01	4.18	4.16	4.02
Organized	4.02	1.03	4.26	4.00	4.01	4.25	4.12	4.14
Directing	4.02	.916	4.01	4.01	3.97	4.05	4.03	3.99
Charismatic	4.00	.914	3.96	4.00	3.84	4.12	3.92	4.04

Table 13 (continued). *Estimated Marginal Means on Leader Traits in Others Rating “Fits My Image of a Leader”*

Source	Mean and Standard		Generation		Gender		Ethnicity	
Leader Traits	Deviation							
	Mean	S.D.	X	Millennial	Male	Female	Caucasian	non-Caucasian
	(N=376)		(n=56)	(n=320)	(n=198)	(n=178)	(n=203)	(n=173)
Decisive	3.97	.983	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.06	4.05	3.86
Humanitarian	3.96	1.03	4.13	3.94	3.77	4.29	3.88	4.19
Industrious	3.87	.897	3.88	3.86	3.65	4.09	3.99	3.75

Note. On a 5 point scale.

In this study, the highest rated trait, trustworthy ($M= 4.77$, $SD=.496$) received no rating less than three on a five point scale. This rating identifies responses to “fits my image of a leader” as moderately well, very well, or extremely well. In the original research of Lord Foti, and DeVader (1984), trustworthy received a prototypical score of 4.26, and a rating of 17th on the list of 35 traits. As noted in Table 13, the traits with the ten highest mean scores identified in this study were: trustworthy, loyal, responsible, honest, fair, understanding, cooperative, open-minded, dedicated, and determined.

Of the top ten ranked, there were three leader traits identified in this research that rated prototypical scores in the top ten of the original research of Lord and colleagues (1984). They were: (a) dedicated, ranked 9th in this study ($M=4.50$), rated 1st in original research with a prototypical score of 4.65; (b) responsible, ranked 3rd in this study ($M=4.65$), rated 6th in original research with a prototypical score of 4.44; and (3) determined, ranked 10th in this study ($M=4.47$), rated 8th in the original research with a prototypical score of 4.39. A discussion on these findings is found in chapter 5.

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was completed to compare the group differences across the dependent variables of rated traits of others responding to “fits my image of a leader” based on the three independent variables of generation, gender, and ethnicity. The final dependent variables used for the MANOVA were: (1). generation, X or millennial; (2). gender, male or female; (3) ethnicity, Caucasian or non-Caucasian.

The MANOVA assumption that the population variances among the dependent variable are the same across all variables was violated, indicated by Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices being significant, $F(1890, 181744)=1.33$, $p<.001$. The

MANOVA, using Pillai's Trace with a moderate to large sample size, is robust to violating the assumption of homogeneity of population variances of dependent variables. Pillai's Trace, with two groups, is identical to Wilks' Lambda results.

There were no statistically significant differences found for the generation, gender, and ethnicity groups, $F(35, 334) = 1.32, p = .116$, partial eta square = .12, after adjusting for 35 dependent variables. Multivariate testing was completed to find statistically significant differences among the groups on a linear combination of the dependent variables. The significance level used for the MANOVA was adjusted using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .0014, allowing for the 35 dependent variables. The Wilks' Lambda was used to evaluate group differences. In reviewing the results of generation, gender, ethnicity on the combined dependent variables for rating leader traits responding to "fits my image of a leader", there was no statistically significant difference: $F(35, 334) = 1.32, p = .116$, Wilks' Lambda .88, after adjusting for 35 dependent variables (see Table 14).

Table 14

<i>Multivariate Analysis of Variance Reports for Rating Leader Traits in Others</i>				
Source	<i>Df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	η^2
Generation	35	1.46	.051	.13
Gender	35	1.94	.002	.17
Ethnicity	35	1.71	.010	.15
Generation*Gender	35	1.83	.004	.16
Generation*Ethnicity	35	1.54	.031	.14
Gender*Ethnicity	35	1.00	.475	.10
Generation*Gender*Ethnicity	35	1.32	.116	.12

As indicated in Table 14, no statistically significant differences were found between generation X and the millennial generation group participants, $F(35, 334) = 1.46$, $p > .0014$, Wilks' Lambda .87; no statistically significant differences were found between male and female participants, $F(35, 334) = 1.94$, $p > .0014$, Wilks' Lambda .83; no statistically significant differences were found between Caucasian and non-Caucasian ethnicity, $F(35, 334) = 1.71$, $p > .0014$, Wilks' Lambda .89; indicating there are no main effects.

Also analyzed were the independent variable combinations of generation and gender, $F(35, 334) = 1.83$, $p > .0014$, Wilks' Lambda .84; generation and ethnicity, $F(35, 334) = 1.54$, $p > .0014$, Wilks' Lambda .86; and gender and ethnicity, $F(35, 334) = 1.00$, $p > .0014$, Wilks' Lambda .91; with no statistically significant differences found for the dependent variables for "fits my image of a leader". The results indicated that the responses of the community college students on the rating of 35 leader traits in others did not differ significantly based on generation, gender, ethnicity, or any combination of the three. There were no follow-up analyses conducted as a result of finding no significant differences between the groups and combinations of groups including generation, gender, and ethnicity.

Summary

The two research questions were answered with descriptive statistics indicating the orders of responses of the 376 culturally diverse participants' ratings of behaviors for self in which the two highest rated statements, indicating the most frequently practiced behaviors, were: "I treat others with dignity and respect"; and "I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make". On the multivariate analyses for questions

rating exemplary behaviors for self and leader traits of others, the community college students did not differ significantly based on generation, gender, ethnicity, or any combination of the three. As discussed in chapter 5, additional research could further the work to show the impact of generational and gender membership; implications of culturally bound abstract categorizations of leader behaviors for self and perceptions of others; with considerations to examine support for universally endorsed categorization.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The community college is serving an increasingly vital role as an institution of higher education. For the past century, since its origination as an unique institution it have been instrumental in preparing the country's workforce and educating individuals who may have not opportunity to access higher education elsewhere; as well, community colleges leaders have been accountable as they prepare a global citizenry with a sense of ethical, social, civic, and personal responsibility (Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges in California, 2001; Brint & Karabel, 1989).

At a crossroad in this century, the demographic and socio-economic trends; and current realities and subsequent societal needs need to be evaluated by community college leaders. Multiple demographic and socio-economic trends need to be taken into account. Current community college enrollments are over 44% of U. S. higher education students, with first time freshmen representing 40% of all enrolled U.S. community college students of whom 39% are first generation college attendees; and 36% minorities (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009a). There are projections that by 2015 one to two million additional young adults will seek access to college, many from low income and minority families (Greater Expectations, 2000) and higher immigration rates will be reflected in attendees (Humphreys, 2000). In challenging socio-economic times, there is an expected 31% increase in enrollment of older students, and an increase in enrollees benefitting from the average annual tuition and fees of one-third of the average cost for four-year institutions (American Association of Community Colleges, 2009b). Another factor to consider is a projection that by 2016, greater than 49% of

workforce participants will be women, with 39% reported working in management, professional, and related occupations (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009).

Current realities and subsequent societal needs must also be considered. In many organizations and industry, a new leadership paradigm is practiced which champions collaborative, flexible, and interdependent leader behaviors as central to meeting the necessary commitment and direction needed within changing organizational cultures (Martin, 2005; Raelin, 2005). These processes are relational and practiced by value clarification, finding a voice, advocating, setting an example that is aligned with values and beliefs, and choosing involvement (Kouzes & Posner, 2008) which empowers individuals to consider self as a leader, a person of influence (Outcalt, Faris, McMahon, Tahtakran, & Noll, 2001); and a change agent (Astin, 1997). Also impacting organizations are needs toward leader preparation for a changing nature of less traditional (Martin, 2005; Raelin, 2005) and best practice (Kouzes and Posner, 1987; 2002) leadership.

The new leadership paradigm requires individuals recognize and develop leader “attributes” to have an advantage to fulfill leader opportunities in varied workforce and community settings. These attributes are defined in this study as qualities for traits, dispositions, and skills in practice and character while serving in, or viewing, the role of leader. Workplace environments are reporting the use of culturally diverse teams (Combs, 2002; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998) and identify value for individuals to “transcend the limits of their own perspectives” (Kezar, 2000, p. 11). This transcendence can be facilitated by identifying what is valued, reflecting and developing self-awareness, and displaying empathy and openness to others.

A significantly diverse population distinct to the community college setting is bringing together individuals who need to learn to work and serve together as they prepare for educational, economic, and personal opportunities. The students enrolled represent diverse peoples with cultural influences of generation, gender, and ethnicity. As a result of multiple factors, community college need to assess the student stakeholders on their campus, recognizing students represent a microcosm of the population from the communities served, as well as the workplaces and institutions in which these students will practice as leaders, collaborators, and persons of influence. Higher education leaders can view leadership development as developing human potential (Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

These factors support a compelling force to develop human potential by building leader identity. Creating a leader identity and developing efficacy for self and others has been shown to contribute to an individual viewing self as capable, an agent for change (Bandura, 1994; Hurtado, 2006; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Stanford-Blair & Dickmann, 2005), and with an increased likelihood to seek out opportunities to provide leadership. The intellectual and communication skills, once needed for those in leadership positions and therefore with power to act, are now being recognized as important skills required of each individual (Schneider, 2008).

Research has shown that two initial steps in clarifying and acting on one's own potential for becoming a leader and a responsible citizen (CAS, 2003; Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education, 2007) and, in acknowledging differences (Arsenault, 2004; Paine, 2006) is influenced by two foundational processes of: (1) an early identification of leader attributes in self and others (Hall & Lord, 1995;

Lord & Maher, 1991; Welch, 2000), and (2) recognition of modeling behaviors (Buford, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

This is relevant to the culturally diverse community college setting because researchers have identified that cultural views may exert an emotional focus for self, relationships with others, in motivation toward work, preference for leaders, and value for a strong sense of obligation toward a leader (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). As a community based institution, community colleges and stakeholder partners are at an advantage to develop leaders with a sense of civic responsibility to lead (Astin & Sax, 1998; DeZure, 2008) and who represent and are responsive to, the values and realities of the community (Bonsall, Harris, & Marczak, 2002; Williams, 2001). There is a cautionary note from researchers that in light of increasing numbers of diverse students, educational institutions need to address equity and acquire an inclusive learning environment for the benefit of all students (Humphreys, 2000) and stakeholders of the institution.

In the current economic reality, community colleges need to be prudent while setting stimulating goals for innovative practices, sustaining or improving community college quality while serving the missions for transfer preparation, programs and credentialing for new and returning workers, and contributing to lifelong learning that is necessary in today's world. These factors have contributed to the need for community college leaders to stop at this crossroad to examine the missions, reaffirm what is needed and valued, and strategically plan and prioritize for their institution and its position in higher education.

Purpose of This Study

Despite the many factors prompting community colleges to examine, restate, and recommit to missions including student development initiatives, there is a dearth of research process, acquired data, and evidence in the higher education literature that is specific and pertinent to community college student leadership development. Considering the increasing role of the community college as a higher education institution positioned to prepare students as citizen-leaders and persons of influence (Astin & Astin, 1995; Mable, 2007; Rost & Barker, 2000); and, the literature identifying the impact of multi-generational and increased diversity within community colleges reflective of the population and workplace (Bennis & Thomas, 2002; Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Combs, 2002; Critchley, 2004; Hopkins & Hopkins, 1998; Martin & Tulgan, 2006) this study was timely and relevant. With evidence that a foundation for becoming a leader and responsible citizen (CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education, 2003) is grounded in an individual engaging in assessment and early identification of leader attributes in self (Hall & Lord, 1995; Lord & Maher, 1991; Welch, 2000) and others (Buford, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 1987), this study provided an opportunity to gather data as a first step in recognizing significant issues of diversity (Arsenault, 2004), and acknowledging commonalities, in the community college populations. This study may be significant to community college leaders in recognizing, prioritizing and employing data to make decisions pertinent to mission and strategic goal setting.

At the institution where this study was completed the 2011-2015 strategic plan outlines the institutional goals starting with general assumptions. Two of the general assumptions state: (a) the college mission, values, strategic priorities, and student and

stakeholder needs and preferences are the driving forces for the college goals; and, (b) the ongoing and quality improvement recommendations and decisions that will be made to promote student success will be based on the best available data. Community college leaders representing their institutions from varied geographic location; differing institutional size; and varying current strategic priorities; may employ and benefit from these assumptions. There may be commonality in these goals and the outcomes that are sought. It is incumbent upon us as community college leaders to assess our students and what views are held by these stakeholders. Therefore, this study addressed this problem by assessing reports of views of culturally diverse populations in order to gather data that may facilitate the necessary and realistic initiatives for students in fulfilling roles as collaborators and leaders within workforce and community settings.

Research Questions

Based on the literature review supporting issues of diversity and to gather data, two research questions were posed for this study:

Question 1: Is there a statistically significant difference in the two generations of community college student participants' self-reports of engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors for "modeling the way" and "enabling others to act", based on generation, gender, ethnicity?

Question 2: Is there a statistically significant difference in the two generations of community college student participants' reports on their "rating of leader traits" identified in others, responding to "fits my image of a leader", based on generation, gender, ethnicity?

Review of the Methodology

The population for this study was United States community college students. The sample consisted of 376 participants from an enrollment over 18, 600 students in a Midwestern, suburban, public community college. The student participants represented at least 26 communities with a total population of nearly 400,000 persons of varied generational, socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds. The computer generated, random course selections used were 26 credit, certificate, or program course offerings held in day, evening, and hybrid classes. The purpose of this non-experimental study was to determine if community college student participants differed significantly in their self-report of engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” as identified by Kouzes and Posner (2002); and, reporting leader traits in others responding to “fits my image of a leader”, as identified by Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984), and to determine if their responses differed significantly by generation, gender, ethnicity.

Based on the operational definition of culture, the three independent variables were: (1) generation, (2) gender, and (3) ethnicity. The generations were defined as generation X members with birth years 1961-1981 who were ages 29-49; and millennial generation members with birth years 1982-1992 who were ages 18-28. The three dependent variables were: (1) leader behaviors for “modeling the way”, (2) leader behaviors for “enabling others to act”, and (3) ratings of 35 leadership traits viewed in others responding to “fits my image of a leader”.

The $N=376$ participants were comprised of $n=56$ members of generation X, and $n= 320$ millennial generation members; $n=198$ male, $n= 178$ female gender; $n=203$

Caucasian, $n=173$ non-Caucasian. There were seven categories to report ethnicity on the research survey. The Caucasian/White representation was identified by 53.9% of participants. As seen in Table 8, the non-Caucasian category was comprised of individuals reporting a racial and ethnic identity as: American Indian/ Alaska Native .08%; Asian/ Pacific Islander 5.6%; Black/ African-American 7.2%; Arab/ Arab-American 10.1%; Hispanic/ Latino 15.4%; and “Other” 6.9%. Because of the low numbers reported these six ethnicity groups were collapsed into the non-Caucasian category for the multivariate analyses.

The research instrument (see Appendix A) was comprised of three sections aimed to answer the research questions. A demographic section assigned proper placement to the generation X and millennial cohorts, as well as identified gender and ethnicity of the participants. The second section of the research survey was a modified version of the Third Edition of the Leadership Practice Inventory (2003) developed by Kouzes and Posner. It was modified with respondents reporting on two of the five exemplary leader behaviors resulting in the selection of 12 questions for participants’ responses. Six questions for leader practice behaviors related to “modeling the way”, and six questions for leader practice behaviors related to “enabling others to act”. The Leadership Practices Inventory was selected for this study as it has been deemed an effective measure in the assessment and development of an individual as an exemplary leader (Kouzes & Posner, 1990, 2002, 2003, 2008; Posner, 2009).

The two leader practices were chosen for this study because they represent attributes for developing a sense of self as well as the fostering of the development of others, serving as personal and interpersonal behaviors. The practice of “modeling the

way” is represented by value clarification; finding a voice; advocating; setting an example that is aligned with values and beliefs; and choosing involvement (Kouzes & Posner, 2008). The practice of “enabling others to act” involves fostering collaboration and co-operation; building trust; strengthening others; and developing confidence and competence (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The research instrument elicited an individual response for each of the six statements that represent the exemplary leader behaviors for “modeling the way”: (1) I set a personal example of what I expect of others, (2) I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on, (3) I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make, (4) I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance, (5) I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization, (6) I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.

Additionally, it elicited the responses for the six statements that represent the exemplary leader behaviors for “enabling others to act”: (1) I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with, (2) I actively listen to diverse points of view, (3) I treat others with dignity and respect, (4) I support the decisions that people make on their own, (5) I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work, (6) I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves. Participants were instructed to answer the questions relating to any leadership role they have been in or are serving in currently; and to consider each statement in the context of a student, work, or personal organization with which they have been involved as a formal or informal leader. Examples would include, but would not be limited to a club, team, chapter, group, unit, project, program, or service.

The third section of the research survey was the ratings of leadership traits list, derived from the research of Lord, Foti, and DeVader, which identified the perception of leadership traits reported as “fitting my image of a leader” (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984) completed within a four-year institution. Lord, et al., (1984) proposed that leaders are distinguished from non-leaders based on an abstract prototype and used 11 different contexts of military, educational, business, religious, sports, world political, national political, financial, minority, media, and labor for specific types of leaders. The second theoretical framework guiding this study was based on the social-cognitive process of viewing others as leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991). It was chosen to recognize the perception of leader traits, which empirical research identifies is crucial to personal and organizational behavior (Lord & Maher, 1991). Research has shown that the identification of leader traits in role models from diverse cultural backgrounds may promote an individual in making meaning for self (Hall & Lord, 1995; Kezar, 2000; Lord & Emrich, 2001; Welch, 2000) and in establishing inter-dependent relationships (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

For the purpose of this study, participants were given consistent verbal and written instructions prior to rating the 35 prototypical leader traits of others, responding to “fits my image of a leader” from 1 (not at all well) to 5 (extremely well) from the list, created in hierarchal order based on the original research. For this community college research study, the numerical ratings of the 35 items were analyzed for significant differences between and within the generational, gender, and ethnic groups in the process of viewing leaders, as described in detail in chapter 4 and in the discussion of the findings for research question two.

Summary of the Findings

The first research question addressed the self-reporting of the community college participants' for engaging in the exemplary leader behaviors for "modeling the way" and "enabling others to act". In addition to univariate statistics, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was completed on the data for research question one. A MANOVA was chosen because it emphasizes the mean differences and statistical differences among groups and to determine if there was a main and interaction effect between the independent variables and if the interaction is significant (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 247). It has an advantage over a series of ANOVA when attempting to identify a combination of dependent variables which may be more powerful and also protects against inflated Type I error. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to compare the group differences and interrelationships across the dependent variables.

In order to conduct the MANOVA, scale scores were created for a modeling scale and an enabling scale. Each scale, comprising a new dependent variable, was created by summing the six items representing each of the exemplary leader behaviors and dividing by six, allowing for the mean score to be calculated. The MANOVA analysis indicated that the responses of the 376 community college students did not differ significantly based on generation, gender, ethnicity, or any combination of the three. There were no follow-up analyses conducted as a result of finding no significant differences between the groups and combinations of groups. Based on the responses to this study's multivariate analysis, the hypothesis that there would be significant differences in self-reports that were reflective of generational membership, gender identity, ethnicity was not confirmed.

There is a possible explanation for the lack of statistically significant differences found in the community college participants' responses of this study. For the most part, the participants are representatives of 26 culturally diverse communities and have attended the same primary and secondary educational system in the districts served by the community college. The fact the students have developed relationships with others from diverse backgrounds may have created more of an acquired sense of community. If the premise that cultural effects of generation (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Martin & Tulgan, 2006), gender, ethnicity, contribute as determinants of workplace behaviors, motivation, and views toward leaders; the process of socialization and a sense of communality prior to workplace experiences may occur, and needs to be examined.

The community college students mean scores were similar to results found in the study of Posner (2009) as the results of this research indicated the mean scores for behaviors for "modeling the way" and "enabling others to act" were higher for generation X than millennial members; females higher than males; and non-Caucasian ethnicities rated themselves higher. Posner (2009) reported the analysis on the findings of online data which was collected from over 1 million respondents from 2005-2008; noting that the demographic information was voluntarily provided by approximately one in five respondents. In comparison to the two age levels of this study: generation X (29-49 years) and millennial generation (18-28 years), Posner (2009) reports an ANOVA comparison for respondents using the demographic age range of under 33; and 33-49 years; finding results on the leadership behaviors to be statistically different ($p < .001$). Also reported as statistically different ($p < .001$), were *t*-test comparisons between male and female gender. Ethnicity, defined in the Posner (2009) study, as Caucasian and

“people of color”, was analyzed using *t*-tests and an ANOVA and found to be statistically different ($p < .001$) for all five leadership practices, including the two exemplary behaviors of “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” examined as scale scores in this research. Posner reported the findings of the three year study, stating individuals who were older generally rated practices higher; females rated practices higher than did male counterparts; and “people of color” reported practicing behaviors higher than did Caucasian respondents.

The data of this research study were analyzed to compare the “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” behaviors using scale scores. To place this study into context, the respondents were instructed to reflect on the formal and informal leader roles they assume, answering as they actually, not ideally, perform the behaviors. The results show these community college participants had higher responses scores as reflected in the mean and scale scores, for the practiced behaviors of “enabling of others to act” than the behaviors for “modeling the way”. The “enabling others to act” behavior “I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves” was scored as practiced by both generation X ($M = 8.91$) and the millennial generation ($M = 8.41$) respondents as “usually” to “very frequently” practiced. This statement and others representing the enabling behaviors reflect relational, fostering behaviors, and a tendency toward strengthening others. The ratings for the behaviors to “enable others to act” may indicate practices based on the current personal and interpersonal demands these community college students need to meet as part of their relationships with others.

These findings are consistent with the demographic reports on students in higher education. The contemporary non-traditional college student is not defined by a

generational or age demographic; nor, by the traditional role of student-citizen (Vaughan, 2000). Instead, the “non-traditional” college student today is characterized by having multiple and varied roles, including a role as a parent; as a working individual with stringent economic needs (Pepicello, 2000); with 39% community college students reported as first generation college attendees, from diverse ethnic backgrounds (Greater Expectations, 2000). As a result of these factors and circumstances, these students may already be creating a leadership identity and leader emergence with attitudes and practice of skills for “enabling others to act” which is a foundation for interpersonal relationships. The fact that these students may have new or different needs and circumstances requires community colleges leaders and educators at each institution to find measures to identify the profile of each student body. There is benefit to developing a clear view of the composition, needs, perspectives, and attitudes of the student population, which represents the community being served by the college.

What is noteworthy is that the response for a “modeling the way” behavior of “I set a personal example of what I expect of others” is rated as practiced less frequently, particularly by millennial generation ($M=7.28$) and male ($M= 7.28$) respondents. It may be possible that these students view “modeling the way” behaviors differently from what they reportedly are practicing. The behaviors reported for treating others with dignity and respect, following through on commitments and promises, developing relationships, and listening to others, could conceivably be viewed as behaviors for setting a personal example. A follow-up survey relating to students perceptions of “modeling” behaviors may be in order. The data may serve as a first step in recognizing self-attributes and introducing self-efficacy behaviors considerate of a students’ perspective.

Prior to conducting the MANOVA analysis, the mean scores and standard deviation were completed on the 12 original survey items representing the self-rated leader behaviors. The data in Table 10 lists the 12 behaviors, in descending rank order by highest means, and shows generation, gender, and ethnicity means for comparison. Overall, the univariate analyses of the practice of exemplary leader behaviors were similar to the findings of previous studies. In this community college study, the three behaviors in which students responded to “How frequently do I engage in the behavior described”, matched the three highest behavioral statement responses in the landmark study outside of higher education with more than 100, 000 individuals reporting behaviors for self (Posner, 2009). As shown in table 10, in descending order, the three statements that received the highest reports were: “I treat others with dignity and respect”; “I follow through on the promises and commitments I make”; and, “I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with”. Notably, the mean scores for the top three reported behaviors in this study are compared to the study reported by Posner (2009) finding, respectively: “I treat others with dignity and respect ($M=9.21$, $SD=1.20$) and Posner reports ($M=9.23$, $SD=1.05$); “I follow through on the promises and commitments I make ($M=8.70$, $SD=1.35$) and Posner reports ($M=8.81$, $SD=1.17$); “I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with” ($M=8.56$, $SD=1.47$) and Posner reports ($M=8.68$, $SD=1.26$).

In examining generational reports, as noted in Table 10, five of the six mean scores for the exemplary behaviors for “modeling the way” reflected more practice by generation X cohort respondents than the millennial cohorts. One modeling behavior “I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles

and standards we have agreed on” received the same mean score of members of both generations: X and millennial. From the data on behaviors for “enabling others to act” the behavior “I treat others with dignity and respect” was rated a Mean score of 9.22 by millennial cohorts and a Mean score of 9.16 by generation X respondents. This finding is consistent with the generational literature, noting the millennial generation cohorts are fair, civic minded and team oriented, accept and value diversity, and possess a global mentality (Dulin, 2008; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Raines, 2002; Rice, 2007).

As discussed in chapter 2, the research on gender differences indicates females view and practice leadership differently (Carless, 1998; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Groves, 2005; Rice, 2007) preferring open communication styles and practicing interpersonal skills for collaboration and growth of others. In this study, female responses for practice behaviors and leader traits in others support what is found in the literature. As noted in Table 10, the behaviors for “following through on commitments and promises”, “ensuring growth”, and “building a consensus” rated higher mean scores than mean scores reported by males. Additionally, as noted in Table 13, leader traits in others indicated mean scores for caring, concern, verbal skills, charismatic, and humanitarian were scored higher responding to “fits my image of a leader” than the scores for male participants.

Of all the 12 behaviors examined in this study, the two behaviors that received the lowest responses for practice by the 376 participants were: “I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization”; and “I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance”. In the research of Posner (2009) the behavior of “asking for feedback” also received the lowest rating by scores, indicating the least

practiced. The behaviors for asking for feedback and for building consensus exemplify intrapersonal and interpersonal skills which, when developed, can serve an individual in varied arenas.

The data are timely for community college leaders to open channels for communication thereby creating a climate for embracing diverse views of individuals while recognizing the strengths held in common. While there are many initiatives on the nation's college campuses relating to diversity there is a need to recognize the beliefs, strengths, and practices students hold in common acknowledging behaviors reflective of the concerns and responsibilities encountered by these citizen-students. Considerations for acknowledging and inviting contributions from the student population may result in a discovery of views, ideas, and perspectives that are in common, have been overlooked, or remain undiscovered, as a result of community college leaders' view through ones' own cultural lenses.

The second research question addressed the rating of leader traits in others, responding to "fits my image of a leader". The literature supports the concept that a view of leadership is based on a fit of a perceiver's own implicit ideas of leader characteristics and a process of matching, which may play a significant role in ones' own leader attributions and may sequentially play into leader and follower relationships (DenHartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999; Lord & Maher, 1991) and judgments that are made (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984). A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to compare the group differences and interrelationships across the dependent variables. The results indicated that the responses of the community college students on the rating of 35 leader traits in others did not differ

significantly based on generation, gender, ethnicity, or any combination of the three. There were no follow-up analyses conducted as a result of finding no statistically significant differences between the groups and combinations of groups including generation, gender, and ethnicity.

In this research, the 376 participants rated 35 leader traits responding to whether the trait “fits my image of a leader”. The complete list, disaggregated by generation, gender, and ethnicity, is found in chapter 4. The data in Table 15 identifies the descending order of mean scores rated by community college respondents compared to the findings of Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) listing scores for prototypical ratings, one measure of their assessment in the original research. The analysis reveals the order of the top ten positions, rated by highest mean scores were: trustworthy, loyal, responsible, honest, fair, understanding, cooperative, open-minded, dedicated, and determined.

There were three traits found in the top order in both this research and the original research of Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984) examining prototypicality [*sic*] scores. These were: dedicated, rated in first position in the original research, and 9th in this study; responsible which placed 6th in the original research and 3rd in this study; and, determined, rated 8th in the original research, and 10th in this study. The highest rated trait in this study, trustworthy, received a “very well” to “extremely well” rating by 96.6% of respondents reporting “fits my image of a leader”. In the original research of Lord and colleagues (1984) the rating of trustworthy (prototypicality score 4.26) resulted in a placement of 17th on the list of 35 traits.

Table 15

The 35 Leader Traits as Identified by Community College Students (2011) and Respondents in the Research by Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984)

Source		Community College Respondents		Source	Lord, Foti, and DeVader Respondents
Leader Traits	Mean	S.D.	Leader Traits	Prototypicality	
Trustworthy	4.77	.496	Dedicated	4.65	
Loyal	4.68	.631	Goal oriented	4.52	
Responsible	4.65	.601	Informed	4.48	
Honest	4.63	.690	Charismatic	4.48	
Fair	4.54	.711	Decisive	4.44	
Understanding	4.54	.677	Responsible	4.44	
Cooperative	4.53	.669	Intelligent	4.39	
Open-minded	4.51	.752	Determined	4.39	
Dedicated	4.50	.693	Organized	4.39	
Determined	4.47	.726	Verbal skills	4.30	
Caring	4.46	.789	Believable	4.30	
Strong character	4.46	.754	Directing	4.30	
Likeable	4.43	.797	Good administrator	4.30	
Believable	4.40	.731	Honest	4.26	
Goal-oriented	4.39	.775	Concerned	4.26	
Educated	4.36	.742	Disciplined	4.26	
Interested	4.36	.777	Trustworthy	4.26	
Disciplined	4.32	.835	Fair	4.22	

Table 15 (*continued*).

The 35 Leader Traits as Identified by Community College Students (2011) and Respondents in the Research by Lord, Foti, and DeVader (1984)

Source		Community College Respondents		Source	Lord, Foti, and DeVader Respondents
Leader Traits	Mean	S.D.	Leader Traits	Prototypicality	
Concerned	4.30	.841	Strong character	4.22	
Intelligent	4.25	.839	Open-minded	4.15	
Informed	4.22	.778	Persuasive	4.15	
Persistent	4.21	.791	Interested	4.13	
Healthy	4.21	.949	Insightful	4.04	
Well groomed	4.17	1.05	Understanding	4.00	
Competitive	4.17	.979	Competitive	4.00	
Insightful	4.15	.825	Cooperative	4.00	
Persuasive	4.06	.890	Loyal	4.00	
Verbal skills	4.05	.895	Educated	3.96	
Good administrator	4.03	.887	Industrious	3.83	
Organized	4.02	1.03	Caring	3.74	
Directing	4.02	.916	Humanitarian	3.74	
Charismatic	4.00	.914	Persistent	3.70	
Decisive	3.97	.983	Likeable	3.61	
Humanitarian	3.96	1.03	Well groomed	3.60	
Industrious	3.87	.897	Healthy	3.52	

Note. On a 5 point scale.

Overall, the traits, trustworthy ($M=4.77$, $SD .496$), and loyal ($M=4.68$, $SD .631$) rated the highest in this study, are consistent with the findings reported in the recent literature. Traits of honesty, integrity, trustworthy, loyalty, are consistently rated highest (Arsenault, 2004; DenHartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 1990, 2005; Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1991). In fact, in three studies, respondents from six continents were asked to select seven characteristics of admired leaders. The most admired trait was “honest” as selected by 83% of respondents in 1987; 88% in 1995; and, 88% again in 2002 (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Across 62 cultures, the trait “integrity”, inclusive of the traits of honest and trustworthy, were found to be strongly and universally endorsed attributes that contribute to outstanding leadership (DenHartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999). In this study, there were no significant data to identify what is noted in the literature indicating cultural differences impact the perception for leader attributes in others (DenHartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999; Ensari & Murphy, 2003; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). In trying or difficult times, individuals look to credible leaders with modeled values and traits, including honesty. These are noted as the behaviors necessary for decision-making, relationship building, and accepting and controlling what is occurring within the environment (Kouzes & Posner, 2005; Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Owen, & Fleishman, 2000; Tulgan, 2004).

Based on the multivariate analysis of the responses of this study, the hypothesis that there would be statistically significant differences in the ratings of the leader traits in others that were reflective of generational membership, gender identity, ethnicity was not

confirmed. One possible explanation is that what is valued in seeking outcomes for self and others in today's social climate may currently be one of a shared collectivism; and is relative to what the students are experiencing in their roles. The traits of an individual as leader: intelligent ($M= 4.25$), informed ($M= 4.22$), verbal skills ($M= 4.05$), good administrator ($M=4.03$), organized and directing ($M=4.02$), charismatic ($M= 4.00$), and decisive ($M= 3.97$) were scored by respondents lower than the scores in which the traits seemed to represent a leader with positive interpersonal traits (trustworthy, loyal, responsible, honest, fair, understanding, cooperative, open-minded, dedicated, determined, caring, strong character). Perhaps situations and roles today impact perception and de-emphasize the need for an individual to possess or project traits once attributed to a leader as an individual or a figurehead.

In this study, the leader traits in others rated higher tend to exemplify relational and interpersonal traits of leaders. This data is consistent with the self-reported exemplary leader behaviors participants rated in research question one. The data from research question one indicated the exemplary leader behaviors for "enabling others to act" were reported as practiced a 7 (fairly often) to a 10 (almost always), with the range of scores indicated as ($M=7.94$ to $M=9.21$). These behaviors for "enabling others to act" are relational, and practiced in the actions of fostering and strengthening others; they are consistent with the reporting for traits which "fits my image of a leader" (trustworthy, loyal, responsible, honest, fair, understanding, cooperative, open-minded, dedicated, caring, strong character); which may be leader traits needed to establish and build effective and desired interpersonal relationships.

Relationship of Current Study to Previous Research

The analysis of the data in this research study using community college students was an examination of the descriptive statistics for each of the 12 self-reported exemplary leader behaviors, identifying mean scores and frequency by generation, gender, and ethnicity. As mentioned, these results for generation, gender and ethnicity are consistent with those reported in the literature in studies outside of academia (Posner, 2009). As there was little written on community college students, this data contributes to what is known about community colleges participants' practices for exemplary behaviors. The community college students responses contribute to a data base on exemplary leader practices, included as individuals who have completed a modified Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Posner, 2009), reporting on two practices in a research context. Studies such as this one may open opportunity for assessing additional data reported by community college students. In completing the 35 trait list on the Leadership Traits Rating, the culturally diverse community college participants, as representative of populations on campuses today, have contributed to a database on views in response to "fits my image of a leader". The order of the list created in this study indicates the ratings reported by $N=376$ community college students matching a prototype from their context, and in current times.

Implications for Community College Practitioners

As is recommended for practice of effective leaders in other arenas (Kouzes & Posner, 2002), community college leaders may use a research study such as this as an opportunity to hear and begin to know the views and values of students stakeholders. The development of individuals to practice within a higher education setting is beneficial to

recognizing what is viewed, valued, and needed in the development of the human potential. A follow-up study to this, which describes behaviors reflecting engaging commitment for personal and social responsibilities, may provide data on the actions today's community college students are practicing on behalf of self and others.

Community college leaders may benefit from answering the question posed in this study: Are community colleges providing the preparation necessary for culturally diverse students to fulfill roles as collaborators and leaders within workforce and community settings? Based on this study, three discussion points for leader consideration can be made for practice by community college leaders. These are: (1) acquiring data which reports the students' leadership practice and views, (2) considering implications of the data in the practice of embracing diversity as one aspect of student preparation, and (3) applying the data on student self-practices and views of attributes in others in creating a campus climate and modeling exemplary behaviors.

First, acquiring data, such as in this study, could serve as a step toward addressing the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2007) initiatives for creating avenues for holistic student development. In applying the research findings, student leader identity could be promoted by campus initiatives. Students who perceive self as leaders may reflect this in scholarly and responsible endeavors in personal, civic, and social choices within and outside of the classroom (Ritchie & Hammond, 2005). As the findings of this study indicate, students report leader skills; therefore community colleges need to allow for practice and strengthening of the view of their individual contributions, seeing self as one who sets an example and models behavior for others.

There were two “modeling the way” behaviors that received the ratings indicating practiced as “sometimes” or “fairly often” similar reports to findings in other research. The statement for a modeling behavior of “building a consensus” received the same Mean score ($M=7.17$) in both this community college research ($SD= 1.83$) and the findings ($M= 7.17$, $SD= 1.93$) of the three year study reported by Posner (2009). The two behaviors of “I build a consensus around a common set of values for running our organization” and “I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance” are rated as the least frequently practiced by the community college respondents. The behavior for eliciting feedback was rated lowest in this study; and lowest in the study by Posner (2009) in which 30 exemplary behaviors were examined.

These results are important for community college leaders and educators to consider. A focus on strengthening the individuals’ ability to learn to perform these behaviors in a constructive, conducive learning environment has potential for intrapersonal development and may improve the quality of leader relationships involving two or more people. By examining and learning the skills to communicate and accept feedback, individuals can be influenced and serve to influence others, in ways which are growth producing and relationship building. Dialogue and discussions on ways to achieve common goals would facilitate development in areas that are currently less practiced.

Face to face interactions may be the optimum means for developing some of these more affective interpersonal skills (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). The fact that the community college student population are commuter students and not commonly together on campus for considerable time allowing for interactions makes it an imperative that quality experiences that maximize skill building are considered. The growth of online education,

social media, and class scheduling to meet citizen-student needs may have a circumscribing effect for face to face encounters. Innovative and appealing ideas are needed to encourage students to engage in opportunities to build consensus, a part of collaboration; and, become receptive to giving and receiving feedback.

Studies such as this one facilitate the acquisition of data reported by the student stakeholders related to the attributions for the practice of leadership. The three highest rating self-reported leader behaviors were: “I treat others with dignity and respect”, “I follow through on promises and commitments that I make, and “I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with”. The self-reports of practice of exemplary leader behaviors, in particular, the “enabling others to act” behaviors, indicate to community college leaders that the currently practiced behaviors by these campus stakeholders may need positive highlighting as leader building initiatives are developed.

Second, community college leaders need to consider student input while embracing diversity initiatives. The study hypothesis that there would be statistically significant differences based on the cultures of generation, gender, ethnicity, was not confirmed. The significance of these results for community college leaders speaks to attaining subjective assessment data as a part of the process in identifying current cultural perspectives of the student stakeholders. The diversity initiatives on each campus should have an avenue for student contributions that reflect perspectives of the campus culture and promote the best services and program development. There needs to be pronounced considerations for acknowledging differences and commonalities while attempting to embrace listening and social skills for relating to the needs of others and earning a voice (Kouzes & Posner, 2008). The exemplars for developing a voice and “enabling others to

act” uphold an ability to accept and maintain ones’ own cultural views, while assimilating and embracing new perspectives which may create a stronger foundation for meeting the challenges for stakeholders.

Third, there may be additive value in recognizing students’ reports on self-practices and views of attributes in others so that community college leaders can model exemplary leader behaviors while creating a supportive campus climate. Examining the results of this study, the highest rated traits responding to “fits my image of a leader” were: “trustworthy, loyal, responsible, honest, fair, understanding, cooperative, and open-minded”. These traits voiced in this study are recognized by followers as important for leaders particularly in difficult, uncertain, and changing times. This data could serve community college leader teams to develop, incorporate, and sustain credible role modeling of the traits viewed by these study respondents; thereby creating a needed, desired, inspiring campus climate.

In addition to creating a campus climate that promotes development of leader attributes in students, role model behaviors are needed. The research indicates there is value to an individual in identifying leader traits in others (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984; Lord & Maher, 1991) including within diverse populations, as contributing to an individual making meaning for self (Hall & Lord, 1995; Kezar, 2000; Lord & Emeich, 2001 and establishing interdependent relationships (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Therefore, a recommendation is made that community college leaders and educators model the behaviors that translate as personal leadership skills. The “modeling the way” behaviors may be demonstrated by teaching faculty who personally model behaviors by participating in college and community events and promote students to engage in college,

civic and community capacities outside the classroom (Brown & Posner, 2001). Adjunct teaching faculty may have positions outside of teaching and may serve as role models by sharing their story and practicing exemplary behaviors while engaging students to feel safe in experiencing “modeling the way” and “enabling others to act” behaviors as were highlighted in this study.

As noted in this research study and the findings of Posner (2009), individuals report the behaviors “I build a consensus” and “I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance” as less practiced behaviors. Community college students are in a setting in which reflection, practice, and development for students could be considered. A deliberate focus on classroom and institution endeavors promoting skill acquisition in these areas would be beneficial. Generational theorists state it is the work of the generations to consider self as change agents (Pilcher, 1994), preparing to accept the responsibilities of the work required for social change; therefore, campus leaders could act in exemplary ways and promote the process of growth and environment for empowerment (Ancona, 2005) required for the next generation of leaders. In completing research as in this study, community college leaders can indicate the value they place in receiving communication from members of the next generations. By seeking and accepting feedback from constituents, and by building an appropriate consensus after eliciting views and information from the next generation of leaders, community college leaders may be meeting college mission and role modeling exemplary leader behaviors.

Study Limitations

The data was collected from one subpopulation of community college students who are enrolled in an institution whose student population is consistent with the

increasingly diverse population seen in community colleges nationally. However, a limitation was found in that the number of respondents were insufficient to support disaggregation of the responses into the seven ethnic groups represented (American Indian/ Alaska Native; Asian/ Pacific Islander; Black/ African-American; Arab/ Arab-American; Hispanic/ Latino; Caucasian/ White; or Other (as specified)). Therefore, prior to completing a MANOVA, the seven ethnicities were collapsed into two groups (Caucasian and non-Caucasian). In future research, the use of stratified, random sampling may ensure adequate numbers are represented for each ethnic group.

There was careful planning to attain the most diverse, inclusive sampling to make this study more generalizable to other community colleges populations. The aim to capture representation of the two generations and genders, and ethnicities, during day, evening, and weekend class offerings was met. However there was a limitation created by the selection process of random computer generated course sections. The process did not allow for the selection of specific attendees, nor was there any control over particular participants available at the point of the survey. Therefore, a stratified selection process is recommended so as to capture a dense, diverse generation and ethnic class attendees. In future studies an oversampling may allow for accessing a numerous, diverse pool of participants to maintain levels of ethnicities within more culturally diverse institutions.

Believing the notification of faculty at the start of a semester may increase the ability for faculty to allow course section participation, a planned dissemination of information on campus months in advance was considered. However, this length of advance notice was not available; the faculty members who were selected and responded with the ability to participate were notified one to four weeks in advance. The initial

contact did have 66% participation rate and the second contact yielded 77% participation of those invited to participate. More details about the study or a short information session may be beneficial for the teaching faculty. When teaching faculty used the research study to relate to course content such as developing surveys, completing research, and applying behavioral studies, it was reported that a dialogue occurred within the classroom. The student participants were informed of the research study at the point of distribution and collection, either at the beginning or end of class time, and a great majority chose to participate. As this presented no study limitations, there are no recommendations for future researchers to change this process or timeframe for students.

Directions for Further Research

Further research is recommended to assess and identify leader identity emergence in community college students today. A benefit to the community college is the ability to make data driven decisions for program development to prepare the next generations as influential leaders (Mable, 2007; Zimmerman-Oster & Burkhardt, 1999; 2000). Using research data, opening dialogue, and allowing contributions of the community college stakeholders may result in community college leaders: (a) planning initiatives that develop leader potential in each person based on the strengths from their cultural perspectives, (b) modeling leader behaviors in the college environment, (c) recognizing the impact of diversity as well as homogeneity, and (e) assisting students in acknowledging the role of self and others in interdependent relationships. It may be beneficial for community colleges leaders to examine the literature and data driven decisions made in other institutions and identify if the framework, processes, and data

may be applicable and useful within their own institutions, thereby, creating a culture of research driven decisions.

There is little in the recent literature relating to community college participants identifying leader traits in others; therefore additional research could further the work to show the impact of generational and gender membership; and implications of culturally bound or universally endorsed categorizations of leader behaviors for self and perceptions of others. Further research in a setting where aggregates of culturally different participants can be maintained is also recommended. If additional studies indicate there are universally endorsed responses found within a context or community, leader development with less emphasis on cultural differences may be more appropriate. Additionally, fewer assumptions and an improved ability to open dialogue may lessen generation and gender bias, and dispel culturally contingent pre-conceived perspectives about the behaviors and beliefs of others.

A recommendation is made for community college studies to gather data on views of the unique student population for rating leader traits in current times, to further the work on followers' perceptions of leader traits. The ratings found in this study indicated a hierarchy representative of relational and interpersonal skills as "fitting my image of a leader" as rated higher than traits which may be attributed to intrapersonal or leader-centric qualities once believed valuable for an individual leader to possess.

Concluding Remarks

This study serves as a beginning in identifying whether or not culture plays a significant role in cognitive schemas as 376 culturally diverse participants rated the exemplary leader behaviors for "modeling the way" and "enabling others to act" as

perceived leader attribution in self. It also presented the rating of the 35 leader traits responding to “fitting my image of a leader” by the same individuals representing cultures of community college students who are stakeholders within higher education, communities, and the workforce. The multivariate analyses of the research data showed no statistically significant differences were found between any combination of generation, gender, ethnicity in responding to views of leader traits in self and others. Community college leaders may need to further examine implications for moving toward the sense of communality and facilitating the movement of diverse groups toward understanding, and a sense of contribution toward common goals.

That the findings showed no culturally significant differences is significant. It is important that community college leaders examine and capitalize on ideas of commonalities in culturally diverse populations. These higher education institutions may serve as the cornerstone for acquainting students to the value for recognizing similarities, common beliefs, and values individuals hold that transcend the differences. The findings of this study provide a starting point to open dialogue between and among students, faculty members, and community college leaders. Perhaps for some community colleges it serves as a template for instituting an assessment on their diverse campuses.

In attempts to build a culture of evidence pertinent to strategic goals (McClenney, 2004), community colleges are positioned for research and development. A community college mission for examining and assisting the development of an educated individual involves improving opportunities for these future leaders to respond, think, act, and make responsible decisions to the varied situations each will encounter. Leader initiatives based on studies such as this support a realistic, relevant appraisal for this time and provide an

opportunity for students to reflect toward actions each may choose for shaping the community and in affecting each other.

REFERENCES

American Association of Community Colleges Community College Fact Sheet (2009a).

Retrieved July 2, 2009 from

<http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Pages/fastfacts.aspx>

American Association of Community Colleges Community College Fact Sheet (2009b).

Retrieved October 2, 2009 from

<http://www.aacc.nche.edu/AboutCC/Trends/Pages.aspx>

Amey, M. (2005). Leadership as learning: Conceptualizing the process. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 689-704.

Anconca, D. (2005). Leadership in an age of uncertainty. *MIT Leadership Center:*

Research Brief. Retrieved October 21, 2011 from: <http://sloanleadership.mit.edu>

Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A., & Sternberg, R. (2004). *The nature of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Arsenault, P. (2004). Validating generational differences: A legitimate diversity and leadership issue. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(2), 124-141.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (2006). Retrieved July 12, 2009 from

www.aacu.org/resources/curriculum/index.cfm

Astin, A. (1991). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. New York: American Council on Education.

Astin, A. W. (1997). Liberal education and democracy: The case for pragmatism. *Liberal Education*, 83, 4-15.

- Astin, A.W., & Astin, H. (1995). *Social change model of leadership development*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute at the University of California, Los Angeles.
- Astin, A.W., & Astin, H. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W.K Kellogg Foundation.
- Astin, A., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision: A cross generational study of leaders and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A., & Sax, L. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39(3), 251-263.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundation of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-Efficacy. In Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, 4, 71-81. New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman Press.
- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1983). Self-evaluation and self-efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 1017-1028.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performances beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1997). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bennis, W., & Thomas, R. (2002). *Geeks and geezers*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- Binard, K., & Brungardt, C. (1997). Learning leadership: Assessing students at the Community College of Denver. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(4), 128-140.
- Bishop, C. (2004). Generational cohorts and cultural diversity as factors in affecting leadership transition in organizations. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(06), 4632B. (AAT No. 3115817).
- Boatman, S. (1999, Fall). The leadership audit: A process to enhance the development of student leadership. *NASPA Journal*, 37(1), 325-336.
- Bonsall, D., Harris, R., & Marczak, J. (2002, Winter). The community as a classroom. *New Directions for Student Services*, 100, 85-95.
- Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). The community college and democratic ideals. *Community College Review*, 17(9), 9-19.
- Brown, L., & Posner, B. (2001). Exploring the relationship between learning and leadership. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 22(5/6), 274-280.
- Buford, C. (2001). Definitions of leadership by college students: An exploratory and descriptive study of the Chicano/Latino experience. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(12), (AAT No. 3035349).
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). *Quick Stats on Women Workers, 2008*. Retrieved on September 15, 2009 from <http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/main.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2010). *Overview of the 2008-2018 projections*. Retrieved on February 13, 2010 from <http://www.bls.gov/oco/oco2003.htm#education>
- Carless, S. (1998). Gender differences in transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives. *Sex Roles*, 39, 887-904.

- Carnevale, A., & Desrochers, D. (2004). *Keeping America's promise: Why learning? The value of higher education to society and the individual*. Education Commission of the States, Lumina Foundation, 39-45.
- Carnevale, A., Gainer, J., & Meltzer, A. (1990). *Workplace basics: The essential skills employers want*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- CAS Professional Standards for Higher Education. (2003). The role of leadership programs for students. *CAS Standard Contextual Statements*, 196-204.
- Catalyst. (2001). *The next generation: Today's professionals, tomorrow's leaders*. New York: Catalyst. Retrieved June 26, 2008 from <http://www.catalystwomen.org>
- Chan, D. (2005). Relationship between generation-responsive leadership behaviors and job satisfaction of generations X and Y professionals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65 (10), (AAT No. 3194291).
- Chemers, M. (1993). An integrative theory of leadership. In M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research* (pp.293-319). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Chemers, M., Watson, C., & May, S. (2000). Dispositional affect and leadership effectiveness: A comparison of self-esteem, optimism, and efficacy. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 267-277.
- Chickering, A. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2003). *The American community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, R. (1978). "Ethnicity: Problem and focus in anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 7, 383, Palo Alto CA: Stanford University Press.

Combs, G. (2002, Spring). Meeting the leadership challenge of a diverse and pluralistic workplace: Implications of self-efficacy for diversity training. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4, 1-16.

Community College Survey of Student Engagement. (2003). *Engaging community colleges: National benchmarks of quality*. Austin, TX.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2007). *Journal of College and Character*, 9(2), 1-5.

Critchley, R. (2004). *Doing nothing is not an option: Facing the imminent labor crisis*. Mason, Ohio: South-Western Educational Publishing.

Cuellar, N., Brennan, A., Vito, K., & deLeon Siantz, M. (2008). Cultural competence in the undergraduate nursing curriculum. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 24(3), 143-149.

Cundiff, N. (2006). Effect of gender and ethnicity on perceptions of prototypical leadership. *Proquest Dissertations and Theses 2006*, 45(06). (AAT No. 1444409).

DenHartog, D., House, R., Hanges, P., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S., & Dorfman, P. (1999, Summer). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/ transformational leadership universally endorsed? [Electronic version]. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 219-257.

DeZure, D. (2008, November-December). Interview with Carol Geary Schneider, President of the Association of American Colleges and Universities. *Change*. Retrieved June 15, 2009 from [http://www.changemag.org/Archives/BackIssues/November-December 2008/full-web-interview-schneider.html](http://www.changemag.org/Archives/BackIssues/November-December%202008/full-web-interview-schneider.html)

- Dulin, L. (2008). Leadership preferences of a generation Y cohort: A mixed methods investigation. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(1), 43-59.
- Eagly, A. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillside, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A., & Johnson, B. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2), 233-256.
- Eagly, A., & Karau, S. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573-598.
- Endress, W. (2000). An exploratory study of college student self-efficacy for relational leadership: The influence of leadership education, co-curricular involvement, and on-campus employment. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(04). (AAT No. 9967894).
- Ensari, N., & Murphy, S. (2003). Cross-cultural variations in leadership perceptions and attribution of charisma to the leader. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 92, 52-66.
- Evers, F., Rush, J., & Berdrow, I. (1998). *The bases of competence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Families & Work Institute. (2002). Generation and gender in the workplace. [Issue Brief]. *Families and Work Institute National Study of the Changing Workforce*.
www.familiesandwork.org
- Fulton-Calkins, P., & Milling, C. (2005). Community college leadership: An art to be practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 233-250.

Funk, W., & Wagnalls, (1995). *New international dictionary of the English language*.

Chicago: J.G. Ferguson.

Garza, O. (2000). A ten year follow-up study of the completers' perceptions of the TAMU Community College and Technical Institute leadership development program minority leadership development project. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(07). (AAT No. 9980148).

George, J. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human Relations*, 53, 1027-1055.

Gerkovich, P. (2001). The next generation: Today's professionals, tomorrow's leaders. *Catalyst*. Sloan Work and Family Research.

Gibson, S. (2007). Generational communication. *The zoom guide to communications*.

Retrieved on June 6, 2008 from www.accentbusinesscommunication.com

Goldrick-Rab, S., Harris, D., Mazzeo, C., & Kienzl, G. (2009, May). *Transforming America's community colleges: A federal policy proposal to expand opportunity and promote economic prosperity*. Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings.

Retrieved on June 2, 2009 from

http://www.brookings.edu/reports/2009/0507_community_college_goldrick_rab.aspx

Greater Expectations National Panel Report (2000). *The learning all students need for the 21st century*. Retrieved September 8, 2009 from

<http://greater+expectations.org/report/3A.html>

Green, S., & Salkind, N. (2005). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

- Groves, K. (2005, Spring). Gender differences in social and emotional skills and charismatic leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 11, 1-25.
- Hall, R., & Lord, R. (1995). Multi-level information processing explanations of followers' leadership perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 265-287.
- Higher Education Research Institute. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development*. (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: University of California Los Angeles.
- Hiller, N. (2005). An examination of leadership beliefs and leadership self-identity: Constructs, correlates, and outcomes. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66 (12), (AAT No. 3202503).
- Hopkins, W., & Hopkins, S. (1998). Diversity leadership: A mandate for the 21st century workforce. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(3), 129-142.
- House, R., & Aditya, R. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo Vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-473.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Humphreys, D. (2000). *Achieving equity as generation Y goes to college: New data*. Retrieved June 11, 2006 from www.diversityweb.org/Digest/Sp.Sm/geny.html
- Hurtado, S. (2006). Linking diversity with the educational and civic missions of higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 30(2), 185-196.
- Institutional Research and Planning Department, (2010). *Census day report*. Palos Hills, IL: Moraine Valley Community College. Retrieved on February 2, 2010 from (http://www.morainevalley.edu/InstResearch/enrollment/spring_10thrace.htm)

- Judy, R., & D'Amico, C. (1997). *Workforce 2020: Work and workers in the 21st century*. Indianapolis, IN.: Hudson Institute, Inc.
- Keller, T. (1999). Images of the familiar: Individual differences and implicit leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(4), 589-608.
- Kezar, A. (2000, July-August). Pluralistic leadership: Bringing diverse voices to the table. *About Campus*, 6-11.
- Kirkpatrick, S., & Locke, E. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *The Executive*, 5, 48-60.
- Komives, S., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. (1998). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1990). The credibility factor: What followers expect from their leaders. *Management Review*, 79(1), 29-33.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2001). *LPI second edition participant's workbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Pfeiffer.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2003). *Leadership Practices Inventory* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2005). Leading in cynical times. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(4), 357-364.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2008). *The student leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Locke, E.A. (2000). *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior* (Ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Lord, R., & Emrich, C. (2001). Thinking outside the box by looking inside the box: Extending the cognitive revolution in leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11(4), 551-579.
- Lord, R., Foti, R., & DeVader, C. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34(3), 343-378.
- Lord, R., & Maher, K. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, Inc.
- Lowery, J. (2001, July-August). The millennials come to campus: John Wesley Lowery talks with William Strauss. *About Campus*, 6-12.
- Mable, P. (2007). CAS: Encouraging moral and civic learning through quality programs and services for students. *Journal of College and Character*, 9, 1-5.
- Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224-253.
- Martin, A. (2005). The changing nature of leadership. *ACCL Research Report 2005*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Martin, C., & Tulgan, B. (2006). *Managing the generation mix*. New York: HRD Press.
- Martinez, M. (2004). *Keeping America's promise: High and rising: How much higher will college enrollments go?* Education Commission of the States, Lumina Foundation, 21-23.

McClenney, K. (2004). *Keeping America's promise: Challenges for community colleges*.

Education Commission of the States, Lumina Foundation, 7-18.

Mello, J. (2003). Profiles in leadership: Enhancing learning through theory building.

Journal of Management Education, 27(3), 344-361.

Milem, J., Chang, M., & Antonio, A. (2006). *Making diversity work on campus: A*

research based perspective. Making Excellence Inclusive. Association of

American Colleges and Universities.

http://www.aacu.org/Inclusive_excellence/document/milem_et_al.pdf

Mumford, M., Zaccaro, S., Harding, F., Owen, J., & Fleishman, E. (2000). Leadership

skills for a changing world: Solving complex social problems. *Leadership*

Quarterly, 11(1), 11-36.

NAS Recruitment Communications (2006). Getting to know generation X. *NAS Insights*.

Retrieved on July 3, 2006 from

<http://www.nasrecruitment.com/talenttips/nasinsights.html>

Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage.

Orcher, L. (2005). *Conducting research*. Glendale CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

Outcalt, C., Faris, S., McMahon, K., Tahtakran, P., & Noll, C. (2001). A leadership

approach for the new millennium: A case study of UCLAs Bruin leaders project.

NASPA Journal, 38(2), 178-188.

Paine, J. (2006). *Cross-generational issues in organizations*. Encyclopedia. Retrieved

April 26, 2009 from

http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=4156&area=ALL

- Pepicello, B. (2009). *Next generation education for next generation students* [Computer podcast]. Presented October 29, 2009 from University of Phoenix.
- Pilcher, J. (1994). Mannheim's sociology of generations: An undervalued legacy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 45(3), 481-495.
- Population Reference Bureau. (2007, May). *The new generation gap*. Retrieved on September 18, 2008 from <http://www.prb.org/Articles/2007/NewGenerationGap.aspx>
- Posner, B. (2002, May 12). The leadership practices inventory: Theory and evidence behind the five practices of exemplary leaders. Appendix0512BP. www.theleadershipchallenge.com
- Posner, B. (2009, August). *Leadership practices inventory (LPI) Data Analysis*. Retrieved on October 21, 2009 from <http://media.wiley.com/assets/203463/LPIAnalysisAug2009.pdf>
- Posner, B., & Kouzes, J. (1988). Development and validation of the leadership practices inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48, 483-496.
- Prussia, G., Anderson, J., & Manz, C. (1998). Self-leadership and performance outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 523-538.
- Pugh D. (2000). College student leadership development: Program impact on student participants. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(08). (AAT No.9984191).
- Raelin, J. (2005). We the leaders: In order to form a leaderful organization, *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 2(12), 18-30.
- Raines, C. (2002). *Managing the generation mix*, 9 Generations www.generationg.org

- Rice, J. (2007). Collaboration and the millennial generation. *International Psychology Bulletin*, 11(1), 4-7.
- Riggio, R. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 649-660.
- Ritchie, J., & Hammond, S. (2005). We (still) need a world of scholar-leaders: Twenty-five years of reframing education [Special issue]. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(3), 6-12.
- Rodriguez, R., Green, M., & Ree, M. (2003). Leading generation X: Do the old rules apply? *The Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(4), 67-75.
- Rost, J. (1993). Leadership development in the new millennium. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1), 91-110.
- Rost, J. (1997). Moving from individual to relationship: A postindustrial paradigm of leadership. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4(4), 1-16.
- Rost, J., & Barker, R. (2000, Winter). Leadership education in colleges: Toward a 21st Century Paradigm. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7, 3-13.
- Rubin, J. (2000). The emerging leaders. An evaluation of the social change model of leadership. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61 (11), (AAT No. 9995826).
- Schettler, J. (2003). Exclusive research that will change the way you think about leadership. *Training*, 40(6), 70-75.
- Schneider, C. (2005, Spring). Making excellence inclusive: Liberal education & America's promise. *Liberal Education*. Association of American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved on September 1, 2009 from <http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-sp05/le-sp05feature1.cfm>

- Schriesheim, C., & Bird, B. (1979). Contributions of the Ohio State studies to the field of leadership. *Journal of Management*, 5(2), 135-145.
- Shertzer, J., & Schuh, J. (2004, Fall). College student perceptions of leadership: Empowering and constraining beliefs [Computer file]. *NASPA Journal (Online)*, 42, 1-10.
- Smith, K. (2005). Exploring alumnae long-term perceptions of an undergraduate leadership course: A case study. *Dissertations Abstract International*, 66(09), (AAT No. 3190011).
- Smola, K., & Sutton, C. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 363-382.
- Stanford-Blair, N., & Dickmann, M. (2005). *Leading coherently*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Steele, M., & Gordon, V. (2006). Advising in a multigenerational workplace. Retrieved April 26, 2009 from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources; <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/generations.htm#gen>
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations*. New York: William Morrow.
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1997). *The fourth turning*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- Tulgan, B. (2000). *Managing generation X: How to bring out the best in young talent*. New York: Norton.
- Tulgan, B. (2004, Winter). Trends point to a dramatic generational shift in the future workforce. *Employment Today*, 30(4), 23-31.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2003). *Current Population Survey*. Retrieved on June 14, 2006

from <http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/school.html>

VanHecke, J. (2008). Responsible citizenship among college students: A study of predictive experiences and values. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(10), (AAT No. 3238103).

Vaidhyanathan, S. (2008, September 18). The generational myth. *The Chronicle Review*, B7-B9.

Vari, A. (2005). An exploration of factors associated with college students' attitudes and beliefs about leadership. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(02), (AAT No, 3163334).

Vaughan, G. (2000). *The community college story* (2nd ed.). Washington DC: American Association of Community Colleges.

Washbush, J. (1998). From where will the leaders come? Revisited. *Journal of Education for Business*, 73(4), 251-253.

Welch, R. (2000, Winter). Training a new generation of leaders. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7, 70-83.

Whittington, F. (2008). Aging America and the boomer wars. [Review of a book]. *The Gerontologist*, 48, 839-844.

Wilcox, B. (2004). Leadership development of community college students: Does participation in the Phi Theta Kappa leadership development studies course have an effect on the development of leadership behaviors? *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(11), (AAT No. 3152297).

- Williams, M. (2001). Collaboration in presenting community leadership development programs: Two and four year institutions of higher education working in partnership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(2), 52-63.
- Wilson, C. (2004). *Keeping America's promise. Coming through the open door: A student profile*. Education Commission of the States, Lumina Foundation, 25-28.
- Zaccaro, S., Kemp, C., & Bader, P. (2004). Leader traits and attributes. In J. Antonakis, A. Cianciolo, & R. Sternberg (Eds.). *The nature of leadership* (pp.101-124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of veterans, boomers, Xers, and nexters in your workplace*. New York: AMACOM
- Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. (1999, Summer-Fall). Leadership in the making: A comprehensive examination of the impact of leadership development program on students. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 50-64.
- Zimmerman-Oster, K., & Burkhardt, J. (2000). *Leadership in the making: Impact and insights from leadership development programs in U.S colleges and universities*. Executive summary. W.K. Kellogg Foundation.

Purpose: This research survey has three purposes. First, it is designed to collect data on your background and information from you as a representative of your generation, gender, and ethnicity. Second, it is designed to collect your views of the behaviors you possess when serving in any leader role. You may be practicing as a leader at home, work, school, or in your community by serving on a committee; being on a team or club; working on a project or program; or, serving within a group or organization. Third, it will collect your view of the traits leaders possess and have you rate them. This research data may be useful to community college leaders in designing leadership opportunities for community college students. Your participation is totally voluntary and you may discontinue at any time. It is important for this research that you answer all the questions honestly and completely.

Please check: Your age: _____ 18-28
 _____ 29-49
 _____ 50+

Please identify your ethnic background:

- ☐ American Indian/ Alaska Native
- ☐ Asian/ Pacific Islander
- ☐ Chinese ☐ Filipino
- ☐ Indian ☐ Japanese
- ☐ Korean ☐ Pakistani
- ☐ Black/African American
- ☐ Arab/Arab-American
- ☐ Hispanic/Latino
- ☐ Caucasian/White
- ☐ Other (*please specify*)

APPENDIX A

MODIFIED LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY-SELF (Kouzes and Posner, 2003)

The purpose of these questions is to help collect *your views of leader behaviors you possess* when serving in any formal or informal leader role at home, work, school, or in the community. Answer in terms of how you typically behave on most days, on most projects, and with most people.

Please consider all questions and respond accurately as you *actually*, not ideally, *perform these behaviors*. It is important you rate a response a number of three or lower if you do not frequently engage in the behavior or the behavior does not apply. Using the scale provided, please circle your response to the question;

“How frequently do I engage in the behavior described?”

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| 1 = Almost Never | 6 = Sometimes |
| 2 = Rarely | 7 = Fairly Often |
| 3 = Seldom | 8 = Usually |
| 4 = Once in a While | 9 = Very Frequently |
| 5 = Occasionally | 10 = Almost Always |

1. I set a personal example of what I expect of others.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

2. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

3. I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. I actively listen to diverse points of view.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

5. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

6. I treat others with dignity and respect.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

7. I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

8. I support the decisions that people make on their own.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

9. I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

10. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

12. I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

APPENDIX A

RATINGS OF LEADERSHIP TRAITS (Lord, Foti, and DeVader, 1984)

The purpose of these questions is to identify your view of the traits *you believe are valuable in others as leaders* serving in any leadership role. Using the scale provided please circle your response to each trait listed answering the statement:

“Fits my image of a leader”

- 1 (not at all well)
- 2 (somewhat well)
- 3 (moderately well)
- 4 (very well)
- 5 (extremely well)

1. Dedicated	1	2	3	4	5
2. Goal oriented	1	2	3	4	5
3. Informed	1	2	3	4	5
4. Charismatic	1	2	3	4	5
5. Decisive	1	2	3	4	5
6. Responsible	1	2	3	4	5
7. Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5
8. Determined	1	2	3	4	5
9. Organized	1	2	3	4	5
10. Verbal skills	1	2	3	4	5
11. Believable	1	2	3	4	5
12. Directing	1	2	3	4	5
13. Good administrator	1	2	3	4	5
14. Honest	1	2	3	4	5
15. Concerned	1	2	3	4	5
16. Disciplined	1	2	3	4	5

17. Trustworthy	1	2	3	4	5
18. Fair	1	2	3	4	5
19. Strong character	1	2	3	4	5
20. Open-minded	1	2	3	4	5
21. Persuasive	1	2	3	4	5
22. Interested	1	2	3	4	5
23. Insightful	1	2	3	4	5
24. Understanding	1	2	3	4	5
25. Competitive	1	2	3	4	5
26. Cooperative	1	2	3	4	5
27. Loyal	1	2	3	4	5
28. Educated	1	2	3	4	5
29. Industrious	1	2	3	4	5
30. Caring	1	2	3	4	5
31. Humanitarian	1	2	3	4	5
32. Persistent	1	2	3	4	5
33. Likeable	1	2	3	4	5
34. Well groomed	1	2	3	4	5
35. Healthy	1	2	3	4	5

“Copyright Robert Lord. All rights reserved. Used with permission.”

APPENDIX B

PERMISSION LETTER TO FACULTY MEMBERS

Dear Colleague,

I am completing my doctorate at Old Dominion University and have been given permission to complete my research at Midwest Community College. I would really appreciate your help in allowing me to survey your [day of week, hour, class, and date] which has been randomly selected using the college computer database. Beth wants me to assure you that this section has not been selected to give a CCSSE survey this spring.

A special opportunity

This research has not been completed within a community college setting before; therefore, it gives students a chance to be participants in grounded research and a great opportunity for educators to contribute to the research process. My research is entitled “*A Study of Two Generations of Culturally Diverse Community College Students Views on Leader Attributes in Self and Others.*”

Time and process

The research survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete and I need approximately 5 minutes to explain, distribute, and then collect. A maximum 10-15 minute time allowance seems appropriate. You will not be required to do anything while students complete the survey.

What do I need from you?

I need to have a written e-mail response acknowledging the time that works best for you in allowing your chosen class to participate and when I should arrive for that class. Please include your classroom number and respond by Day/date, 2011 with your consent to hodkowski@morainevalley.edu

In the event your class situation precludes you from the ability to participate in this class section, please inform me by e-mail. If you have any questions e-mail or call at (area)-phone.

In advance, thank you. Best Regards,

Paula Hodkowski

APPENDIX C

TEXT FOR INSTRUCTIONS TO SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

To be read in each class:

Hello. My name is Paula Hodkowski. I am a doctoral student at Old Dominion University and I have been given permission to complete my research at Midwest Community college. Your class section has been chosen for a special opportunity *to participate* in this research. Your professor [name] has given me class time for you to complete the survey. This is a unique opportunity because this research has not been completed by community college students before. You are first in being able to offer insight into your beliefs, from your generation and culture. It may contribute to leadership opportunities on this campus.

My research project is entitled “*A Study of Two Generations of Culturally Diverse Community College Students Views on Leader Attributes in Self and Others.*” My purpose is to explore *your* views on leader qualities in yourself and others. Please listen for the following disclosures and information:

1. Voluntary participation. You *must* be 18 years of age or older to participate. Your acceptance and completion of this survey is strictly voluntary. You may stop participating at any time without consequence to you. If you have already participated by completing this research survey in a different class, please exclude yourself this time.
2. Confidentiality. This completed survey will have no specific identifiers nor will any be extracted, manipulated, or retrieved by myself or anyone else now or at a later time. Your current age is vitally important to identifying your generational group. Your consent is given by completing and returning this survey. The results in which you remain anonymous will be published in my dissertation document.
3. Important notes. There are no wrong or right answers so it is important to answer as best suites your views and as completely and honestly as possible. In doing so, this will provide accurate, completed data to support *your* views as a representative of your generational, gender, and ethnic group.
4. There are three pages to the survey. The first section is for demographic data that will aid in *placing you in the correct research group*. The second section is on *your views about the attributes you possess in serving as a leader*. Realizing some of you may not have served in a formal leader role please use an informal role and answer accordingly. As written at the top of the survey, these leader roles may include: practicing as a leader at work, school, or within the community. These may include serving on a committee, being a member of a team or club, working on a project or program, or serving within a group or organization. The third section needs to be completed by rating the leader(s) traits *you believe are valuable in others*. Before we begin, are there any questions?

APPENDIX D

PERMISSION LETTERS FOR USE OF COPYRIGHT MATERIALS

Paula J Hodkowski
14108 Putney PL
Orland Park IL. 60462
708-460-6370

James Kouzes and Barry Posner,

I am a doctoral student in the Community College Leadership program at Old Dominion University. I particularly value the position of the community college and its mission to begin the process to prepare future leaders for the workforce and our communities. With the changing nature of leadership and the increasing diversity, I believe leader-collaborator relationships can begin once values, beliefs, and perceptions in self and others is acknowledged. Therefore, I chose my research to gather data where I see a gap in current research.

I am developing my dissertation on *A Study of Two Generations of Culturally Diverse Community College Students Views on Leadership Attributes in Self and Others*.

I am researching statistically significant differences on the responses of generation X and generation Y students related self-assessed behaviors for modeling the way behaviors. Additionally, I will examine any statistically different responses in women and culturally diverse respondents within and between the two generations.

I plan to complete this research in a community college in the first two weeks of February 2010 after completing human subject review processes in Old Dominion University and the participating community college in November 2009.

With your permission, I would like to use and credit you for the research I cited from the *Leadership Challenge* (1987, 2002) the *Student Leadership Challenge* (2008), *The Credibility Factor* (1990), and *Leading in Cynical Times* (2005).

With your permission, I would like to conduct a rating of the five practices of exemplary leadership. In particular, I am researching the behaviors for modeling the way as noted on the *Leadership Practices Inventory-Self*.

I have submitted a signed request to use the Leadership Practice Inventory. I will acknowledge your research in my dissertation and in any publication of my results as well as comply with all the copyright terms.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any suggestions or questions. I look forward to your response. In advance, thank you.

I respect you both for your dedication to research and the promotion of exemplary leadership with respect to others and the integrity of each person. For that, thank you.

Paula J. Hodkowski hodkowski@morainevalley.edu

RE: Permission to use Leadership Practices Inventory

Hodkowski, Paula

Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 8:56 PM**To:** Ellen Peterson [EPeterson@scu.edu]

Dear Ellen, Thank for your timely response. I have signed a copy of the copyright and terms permission and plan to mail it tomorrow morning (Saturday). I am also including a request to James Kouzes and Barry Posner to cite their works in my dissertation literature review. I, personally, feel more comfortable with this approval. I hope this is the place to send this as well.

If it is possible, may I please have a hard copy of the permission and terms letter and any other permission letter for use in my dissertation original. Thank You so much! Paula J. Hodkowski 14108 Putney PL Orland Park IL 60462

From: Ellen Peterson [EPeterson@scu.edu]

Sent: Friday, October 09, 2009 6:16 PM

To: Hodkowski, Paula

Subject: Permission to use Leadership Practices Inventory

Dear Paula,

Please find the permission letter attached which requires your signature before you can use the LPI product. Please sign it and return it to me by email attachment, fax or mail.

If you require a hard copy by mail, please let me know and I will mail it out today.

KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL
 1548 Camino Monde
 San Jose, California 95125
 FAX: (408) 554-4553

October 9, 2009

Paula Hodkowski
 14108 Putney Place
 Orland Park, Ill
 60462
 Email: hodkowski@morainevalley.edu

Dear Ms Hodkowski:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to *reproduce* the instrument in written form, as outlined in your request, at no charge. If you prefer to use our electronic distribution of the LPI (vs making copies of the print materials) you will need to separately contact Lisa Shannon (lshannon@wiley.com) directly for instructions and payment. Permission to use either the written or electronic versions requires the following agreement:

- (1) That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;
- (2) That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement is included on all copies of the instrument: "Copyright © 2003 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission",
- (3) That one (1) electronic copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent promptly to our attention; and,
- (4) That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to us. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,

Ellen Peterson
 Permissions Editor
 epeterson@scu.edu

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) _____ Date: _____
 Expected Date of Completion is: _____

Paula J. Hodkowski
hodkowski@morainevalley.edu

RE: Permission

Hodkowski, Paula

Sent: Friday, October 16, 2009 10:44 AM

To: Lord, Robert G [rgl@uakron.edu]

Thank You!

From: Lord, Robert G [rgl@uakron.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 8:34 AM
To: Hodkowski, Paula
Subject: Permission

Hello Paula,

Thanks for informing me about your intended study. It sounds interesting and you have my permission and support in using the methodology from Lord, Foti, & De Vader (1984). Since you are interested in culturally diverse respondents, you might also want to read the Ensari and Murphy article referenced below.

Good luck with your study.

Bob

Ensari, N. & Murphy, S. E. (2003). Cross-cultural variations in leadership perceptions and attributions of charisma to the leader. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 92, 52-66

VITA

PAULA JEANINE HODKOWSKI

EDUCATION:

Old Dominion University (August 2004-December 2011) Doctorate of Philosophy in Community College Leadership

Lewis University (January 1988) Master of Science Degree in Nursing and Minor in Education

Loyola University of Chicago (May 1978) Bachelor of Science Degree in Nursing

Little Company of Mary School of Nursing (May 1971) Diploma in Nursing

RELATED EXPERIENCES:

Doctoral Internship completed at Moraine Valley Community College (January 2006-April 2007). Contributed 300 internship hours with V.P. Duren; assisting during the building expansion phases at the college. Responsibilities and participation included: all bond referendum phase activities, Student Center and Student Service Building Committee, site visits during planning phase, writer for original architect document for presentation, note-taker for community and partnership focus groups, and contributor to theme development writing

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCES:

Professor of Nursing: Moraine Valley Community College (January 1991-August 2011)

Presenter: "*Multi-Generational Considerations in Nursing Education*" at the Advanced Faculty Academy, South Metropolitan Education Consortium (October 2011)

Presenter: "*Pathways to Retention*" initiative with University of Illinois (Summer 2010)

Presenter: "*Aligning Clinical Expertise with Clinical Nursing Faculty Role*" at the Clinical Faculty Academy, South Metropolitan Education Consortium (Annually, August 2008; August 2009; August 2010)

Team Contributor: Nursing curriculum program development entitled "*Transforming Nursing Education to Meet Nursing Practice Realities*" (Summer 2007-Fall 2009)

CERTIFICATIONS AND AWARDS:

Awarded fellowship for summer study at Old Dominion University in 2011

Honored as member of Team of the Year for curriculum development at Moraine Valley Community College 2009-2010

Awarded membership Golden Key International Honour Society 2008-current

Nominated for Who's Who in North American Colleges and Universities 2008-09

Awarded Professorship at Moraine Valley Community College Fall 2007

Nominated for Master teacher of the year at MVCC 20007

Selected semi-finalist for Professor of the year at MVCC 2006

Awarded fellowship for summer study at Old Dominion University in 2006

Nominated to "Who's Who Among America's Teachers" in 2004

Nominated for Part-Time Teacher of the Year at MVCC in 1993